

ALASKA LEGISLATURE

2495

HOUSE and SENATE FINANCE COMMITTEE FILES, 2003-2004

STATE OF ALASKA
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Representative Jim Holm



119 N. Cushman
Fairbanks, AK 99701
TEL 456-7423, FAX 451-9293

House District 9

State Capitol
Juneau, AK 99801
TEL 465-3466, FAX 465-2937

Sponsor Statement House Bill 67

"An Act relating to construction of highways by the Department of Transportation and Public Facilities."

Alaska statute requires that construction and maintenance contracts be awarded to the private sector on the basis of competitive bid.

However, statute also allows the state to fund small projects or repairs in-house through a "force account," meaning the state uses its own forces to accomplish the work.

To date, force account spending by DOT-PF has been frequently used to fund projects costing considerably more than \$250,000. Not only has this taken these dollars out of the private sector, it also omits the check and balance oversight and transparency of the competitive bid process.

House Bill 67 was introduced to insure that state force accounts are still allowed for smaller jobs while requiring that projects over \$250,000 utilize private contractors in the competitive bid process. Private contractors not only maintain an inventory of specialized equipment and employ skilled managers, but they assume risk-costs, thus providing the state with considerable savings.

From James Richards

DOT&PF FORCE ACCOUNT REPORT

By Calendar Year - Dollar Amounts are in Thousands

Labor - The "Labor" column includes State owned equipment charges. And, where applicable, it includes small contracts let to entities that supplemented State Force Account work.
Other - Material, rental equipment, etc. costs are shown in the "Other" column. Where only an estimated overall cost was available, the cost was placed solely in the "Labor" column. This results in an inflated estimate of the Labor costs associated with Force Account projects.

1998

Number	Name	M&O	Local Agency	Village Safe Water	Labor \$	Other \$
001	NR NHS Road Pave & Bridge Refurb	X			1,764.0	1,386.0
002	CE NHS Crack Sealing & Bridge Repair	X			670.0	249.3
003	KTN-Cent Bus Dist Sidewalk Imp.		X		134.5	70.3
004	NR Surface Maintenance & Bridge Rehab.	X			1,064.0	
005	Selawik Boardwalk Improvements		X		75.0	310.0
006	Rural Ak. Sanitation Rds.-Chignik Lagoon			X	350.0	450.0
007	SE Gold Rush Centennial Enhancements	X			20.2	7.0
008	SE NHS/Non Pave & Bridge Refurb.	X			500.0	
009	Kongiginak Sanitation Boardwalk			X	250.0	450.0
010	SE Jnu-Hazard Elimination	X			48.7	
011	KTN-Waterfront Promenade		X		82.2	17.5
Totals					\$ 4,958.6	\$ 2,940.1

Total dollars committed to surface transportation funding for 1998 was \$ 406.3 million.
 1998 FA work performed = 1.94 % of the total surface transportation program

\$ 7,898.7

1999

001	NR FFY 99 NHS Prev. Maint. & Repairs	X			2,000.0	1,850.0
002	CE Bridge Maint/Repair FY 99	X			284.3	74.8
003	NR FFY 99 Non-NHS Maint. & Repairs	X			836.0	1,064.0
004	CE Crack Seal Program FY 99	X			643.4	224.3
005	SE NHS Pav Rehab.	X			147.0	653.0
006	CE Asphalt Pav Surface Refurb. FY 99	X			383.9	399.6
007	Force Account (AMHS) Wireless Com.	X			33.4	135.6
008	SE Non-NHS Pave. Rehab. FY 99	X			600.0	
009	NR Dalton Hwy. Erosion Control	X			15.3	102.7
010	NR Surface Treatment. Brenwick/Craig	X			73.6	129.4
011	CE FY 99. Non-NHS Fed. Crack Seal Pro.	X			200.4	69.3
Totals					\$ 5,217.3	\$ 4,702.7

Total dollars committed to surface transportation funding for 1999 was \$ 524.0 million.
 1999 FA work performed = 1.89 % of the total surface transportation program

\$ 9,920.0

2000

001	NR FFY 00 NHS M&O Prev. Maint.	X			2,215.6	1,604.4
002	NR FFY 00 CTP M&O Prev. Maint.	X			1,725.5	1,249.5
003	CE: FY 00 Central Region Crack Seal Crew	X			704.3	189.4
004	SE Non-NHS Pavement Rehab. (FFY00)	X			256.7	576.1
005	SE Road Surface Treatment (FFY00)	X			253.6	552.4
006	CE: Interstate Maint. & Bridge Repair FY00	X			260.4	139.3
007	Proi. #66740. Russian Mission AWOS Pad		X		47.2	
008	Proi. #66740. Russian Mission Airport Clearing		X		122.0	
009	CE: Bridge Maint./Repair Non-NHS FY 00	X			278.0	121.5
010	CE: Cascade Shop Reconstruction	X			82.0	230.0
011	SE Haines-Lutak Rd. Storm Drain	X			207.0	
012	Cheformak Sanitation Boardwalk			X	262.2	1,117.8
013	CE: FY00 Non-NHS Fed. Crack Seal Pro.	X			580.6	227.8
014	SE Haines-Chilkat Lake Rd.	X			310.0	190.0
015	SE Skagway-Tajya River Erosion Control	X			90.0	
016	Married Man's Trail Lighting		X		40.6	22.1
017	St. Mary's Airport Rd. Rehab.	X			1,205.6	1,793.0
018	SE Wrangell Airport Control Reg. Shelter	X			11.9	
019	Nunapitchuk Sanitation Boardwalk			X	399.0	1,701.0
Totals					\$ 9,052.2	\$ 9,715.2

Total dollars committed to surface transportation funding for 2000 was \$ 463.8 million.
 2000 FA work performed = 4.05 % of the total surface transportation program

\$ 18,767.4

2001

001	NR FFY 01 M&O Preventive Maintenance	X		7,150.0	
002	CE: FY 01 Non-NHS Fed. Crack Sealing Prog.	X		339.4	86.5
003	NR FFY 01 CTP Pavement Markings	X		7.3	43.3
004	South Naknek Airport Repairs		X	30.0	15.0
005	CE: Bridge Maint./Repair NHS FY 01	X		325.5	35.6
006	Kwigillingok Sanitation Road		X	764.2	2,235.8
007	Cordova Sidewalks Asbestos Removal	X		14.2	2.7
008	CE: Bridge Maint./Repair Non-NHS FY 01	X		373.6	74.0
009	CE: FY 02 NHS Crackseal IPM	X		701.1	210.6
010	CE: FY 02 Non-NHS Crackseal Program	X		670.6	185.6
Totals				\$ 10,375.9	\$ 2,889.1

Total dollars committed to surface transportation funding for 2001 was \$ 429.0 million.

2001 FA work performed = 3.09 % of the total surface transportation program

\$ 13,265.0

2002

001	NR FFY 02 M&O Preventative Maintenance	X		8,860.0	
002	SE Region Road Surface Treatment	X		527.0	
003	Dalton Hwy. Painted Traffic Markings	X		113.6	61.4
004	CR Bridge M& R, NHS FY '02	X		118.5	200.0
005	Soldotna: East Redoubt Ave. Improvements		X	633.0	
006	Statewide Emergency Sign & Traffic Signals	X	X	430.0	
007	Northern Region Winter Trail Marking		X	182.8	111.0
008	King Cove Lagoon Bridge		X		5.0
Totals				\$ 10,864.9	\$ 377.4

Total dollars committed to surface transportation funding for 2002 was \$ 457.0 million.

2002 FA work performed = 2.46 % of the total surface transportation program

\$ 11,242.3

Revised 2/19/3

FISCAL NOTE

STATE OF ALASKA
2003 LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Fiscal Note Number: 41
Bill Version: HB 67
() Publish Date: _____

Revision Date/Time (Note if correction): 2/18/03 Dept. Affected: DOT&PF
Title Construction of Highways by DOT&PF BRU Construction and CIP Support
Component All Regional Components
Sponsor Holm
Requester HTRA Component No. _____

Expenditures/Revenues (Thousands of Dollars)

Note: Amounts do not include inflation unless otherwise noted below.

OPERATING EXPENDITURES	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009
Personal Services						
Travel						
Contractual						
Supplies						
Equipment						
Land & Structures						
Grants & Claims						
Miscellaneous						
TOTAL OPERATING	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

CAPITAL EXPENDITURES						
----------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

CHANGE IN REVENUES ()						
------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

FUND SOURCE (Thousands of Dollars)

FUND SOURCE	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009
1002 Federal Receipts						
1003 GF Match						
1004 GF						
1005 GF/Program Receipts						
1037 GF/Mental Health						
Other (Specify Type--Do not abbreviate)						
TOTAL	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Estimate of any current year (FY2003) cost: 0.0
Mark this box (X) if funding for this bill is included in the Governor's FY 2004 budget proposal:

POSITIONS

Full-time						
Part-time						
Temporary						

ANALYSIS: *(Attach a separate page if necessary)*
If approved, HB 67 would prohibit the department from using state forces to construct (Force Account Construction or FAC) highway projects if the value of the project was greater than \$250,000. The majority of projects that are considered for force account construction are federally funded. Federal provisions require that prior to approval of a force account project, the state must determine that this method will result in cost savings.

Since it is not possible to determine which projects will be considered for FAC over the next six years, we will base the projected savings on Calendar Year 2002. The estimated savings on 2002 force account projects (greater than \$250,000) was \$4,267,700. Assuming the amount of force account projects remains constant over the next six years, the lost savings would total \$25,606,200.

Prepared by: Dennis R. Poshard Phone 465-3904
Division Special Assistant to Commissioner Date/Time 2/19/03 9:45 AM
Approved by: Acting Commissioner Mike Barton Date 2/19/2003
Agency Alaska Department of Transportation and Public Facilities

HOUSE BILL NO. 67

IN THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF ALASKA

TWENTY-THIRD LEGISLATURE - FIRST SESSION

BY REPRESENTATIVE HOLM

Introduced: 1/29/03

Referred: Transportation, Finance

A BILL

FOR AN ACT ENTITLED

1 **"An Act relating to construction of highways by the Department of Transportation and**
2 **Public Facilities."**

3 **BE IT ENACTED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF ALASKA:**

4 *** Section 1.** AS 19.10.170(a) is amended to read:

5 (a) Except as provided in AS 44.33.300, it is the general policy of the state to
6 require the construction of all highways under bid contract in accordance with
7 AS 36.30 (State Procurement Code). However, subject to the provisions of (b) of this
8 section, when the estimated cost of a construction project is less than \$100,000 or
9 when it appears to be in the best interests of the state and the estimated cost of a
10 construction project is \$250,000 or less, the department may perform the work
11 notwithstanding any other provisions of law.

HB

71

HFIN

FILE

FISCAL NOTE

STATE OF ALASKA
2003 LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Fiscal Note Number: 1
 Bill Version: HB 71
 (H) Publish Date: 2/12/03

Revision Date/Time (Note if correction): _____ Dept. Affected: DCED
 Title An Act extending the termination date of the BRU Occupational Licensing (117)
Board of Certified Direct-Entry Midwives Component Occupational Licensing
 Sponsor House State Affairs
 Requester House Labor & Commerce Component No. 2360

Expenditures/Revenues (Thousands of Dollars)

Note: Amounts do not include inflation unless otherwise noted below.

OPERATING EXPENDITURES	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009
Personal Services	14.6	14.6	14.6	14.6	14.6	
Travel	5.1	5.1	5.1	5.1	5.1	
Contractual	8.5	8.5	8.5	8.5	8.5	
Supplies	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Equipment	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Land & Structures						
Grants & Claims						
Miscellaneous						
TOTAL OPERATING	28.2	28.2	28.2	28.2	28.2	0.0

CAPITAL EXPENDITURES						
-----------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

CHANGE IN REVENUES (1156)	28.2	28.2	28.2	28.2	28.2	
----------------------------------	-------------	-------------	-------------	-------------	-------------	--

FUND SOURCE (Thousands of Dollars)

1002 Federal Receipts						
1003 GF Match						
1004 GF						
1005 GF/Program Receipts						
1037 GF/Mental Health						
Other 1156- Receipt Supported Services	28.2	28.2	28.2	28.2	28.2	
TOTAL	28.2	28.2	28.2	28.2	28.2	0.0

Estimate of any current year (FY2003) cost: 28.2
 Mark this box (X) if funding for this bill is included in the Governor's FY 2004 budget proposal:

POSITIONS

Full-time						
Part-time						
Temporary						

ANALYSIS: (Attach a separate page if necessary)

The bill extends the Board of Certified Direct-Entry Midwives to June 30, 2007. In accordance with AS 08.03.020, funding is extended one year following the termination date allowing the board to conclude its affairs. The information above identifies direct expenditure and revenue information included in the FY 2004 Operating Budget request. New funds are not required to implement this bill.

Prepared by: Jennifer Strickler, Administrative Manager Phone (907) 465-2144
 Division Occupational Licensing Date/Time 2/10/03 12:00 PM
 Approved by: Edgar Blatchford, Commissioner Date 2/10/2003
 Agency Department of Community & Economic Development

HOUSE BILL NO. 71
IN THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF ALASKA
TWENTY-THIRD LEGISLATURE - FIRST SESSION
BY THE HOUSE STATE AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

Introduced: 1/31/03
Referred: Labor and Commerce, Finance

A BILL

FOR AN ACT ENTITLED

1 "An Act extending the termination date of the Board of Certified Direct-Entry
2 Midwives."

3 BE IT ENACTED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF ALASKA:

4 * Section 1. AS 08.03.010(c)(8) is amended to read:

5 (8) Board of Certified Direct-Entry Midwives (AS 08.65 010) --
6 June 30, 2007 [2003];

ALASKA STATE LEGISLATURE

Representative Bruce Weyhrauch

HOUSE DISTRICT 4



ALASKA
STATE CAPITOL
JUNEAU, ALASKA
99801-1182

(907) 465-3744
FAX (907) 465-2273

HB 71

Sponsor Statement

Extend The Board of Certified Direct-Entry Midwives

The Board of Certified Direct-Entry Midwives consists of five members appointed by the Governor: one public member, two certified direct-entry midwives (CDMs), one certified nurse midwife, and one physician who is either an obstetrician or who has specialized obstetric training. The duties of the board include examining and certifying applicants, permitting apprentices, holding hearings and ordering disciplinary sanctions. The board also adopts regulations to establish certification and certification renewal requirements.

The board has served as a means to make people practicing midwifery aware of the level of experience and education expected of them. Also, by having a board, the individuals that practice midwifery are held accountable to an established standard of care. Women seeking an alternative to hospital care for normal pregnancy and birth rely on the diligence of the board to enhance both the quality and accessibility of their healthcare. One notable enhancement: the board worked with the State of Alaska to establish Medicaid procedures for CDM services, thereby placing Alaska among eight states which both license their traditional midwives and provide Medicaid reimbursement for their services.

The board is scheduled to terminate on June 30, 2003, and if the legislature does not act this session, the board will have one year to conclude its administrative operations. Based upon recommendations by the Division of Legislative Audit, HB 71 would extend the board's termination date to June 30, 2007.

Released: February 1, 2003

Contact: Rep. Bruce Weyhrauch's office at 907.465.3744

August 17, 2002

Members of the Legislative Budget
and Audit Committee:

In accordance with the provisions of Title 24 of the Alaska Statutes, the attached report is submitted for your review.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY
AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
BOARD OF CERTIFIED
DIRECT-ENTRY MIDWIVES
SUNSET REVIEW

August 15, 2002

Audit Control Number

08-20016-02

This audit was conducted as required by AS 44.66.050 and under the authority of AS 24.20.271(1). Alaska Statute 44.66.050(c) lists criteria to be used to assess the demonstrated public need for a given board, commission, agency, or program subject to the sunset review process. Currently under AS 08.03.010(c)(8), the Board of Certified Direct-Entry Midwives is scheduled to terminate on June 30, 2003. If no legislation is adopted extending this date, the board would be allowed one year in which to conclude its administrative operations.

In our opinion, the termination date for the Board of Certified Direct-Entry Midwives should be extended. The regulation and licensure of certified midwives contributes to the protection of the public's welfare. We recommend the legislature extend the termination date of the Board of Certified Direct-Entry Midwives to June 30, 2007.

This sunset review was conducted in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards. Fieldwork procedures utilized in the course of developing this report are set out in the Objectives, Scope, and Methodology section.

Pat Davidson, CPA
Legislative Auditor

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Objectives, Scope, and Methodology	1
Organization and Function	3
Report Conclusions.....	5
Analysis of Public Need	7
Agency Response:	
Department of Community and Economic Development.....	13

OBJECTIVES, SCOPE, AND METHODOLOGY

In accordance with the intent of Titles 24 and 44 of the Alaska Statutes, we have reviewed the activities of the Board of Certified Direct-Entry Midwives. As required by AS 44.66.050(a), the committees of reference shall consider this report during the legislative oversight process to determine whether the board should be reestablished. Currently, AS 08.03.010(c)(8) requires that the board will terminate on June 30, 2003, and will have one year from that date to conclude its administrative operations.

Objectives

The three central, interrelated objectives of our report are:

1. To determine if the termination date of the board should be extended.
2. To determine if the board is operating in the public interest.
3. To determine if the board has exercised appropriate regulatory oversight of direct-entry midwives.

The assessment of the operations and performance of the board was based on criteria set out in AS 44.66.050(c). Criteria set out in this statute relate to the determination of a demonstrated public need for the board.

Scope and Methodology

Under the direction and supervision of the Division of Legislative Audit, another auditor conducted the majority of this review. We followed professional standards to determine that the other auditor was independent and that their work was competent and sufficient.

The major areas of our review were licensing, examination, and board proceedings. We reviewed and evaluated the following:

1. Applicable statutes and regulations.
2. Compliance with statutes and regulations related to the certification of direct-entry midwives and permits for midwife apprentices.
3. Files and documentation of individuals certified as a direct-entry midwife or permitted to act as a midwife apprentice. Additionally, we reviewed files for individuals applying for certification or an apprentice's permit.

4. Files related to investigations carried out by the Division of Occupational Licensing involving allegations of violations of statutes and regulations related to certified direct-entry midwives or apprentices.
5. Minutes of board meetings and division correspondence files.
6. Annual reports issued by the board.

We also conducted interviews with Division of Occupational Licensing staff.

ORGANIZATION AND FUNCTION

In 1992, the legislature established the Board of Certified Direct-Entry Midwives. The prime sponsor of the legislation that created the board testified before various committees of referral that the intent of the board was to protect the health and safety of the public. The board was to accomplish this by identifying individuals who, practicing as midwives, were willing to pursue technical training and meet specified technical qualifications necessary for formal licensure.

According to the sponsor, insurance companies and state Medicaid would reimburse for midwife services only if the practitioners were properly licensed and certified. He testified that a board is needed to *"develop strict regulations and monitor professional practice by peer review and education. Certified, licensed, high quality care would be available to Alaskans who either prefer home births or are denied financial or geographic access to physicians' care."* The sponsor also identified midwife care as one way to reduce health care costs and related health insurance premiums.

The board promotes the public's health, safety, and welfare by establishing educational, experience, and continuing education requirements for licensed midwives. These requirements are intended to provide assurance that licensed individuals provide a minimum standard of care. State law does allow for midwife services to be provided by unlicensed individuals. As stated in AS 08.65.150, the differentiation is that those not certified under state law *"may not practice midwifery for compensation."*

Membership of the board

Alaska Statute 08.01.020 provides for the following requirements related to appointment to the board:

Board members are appointed by the governor and serve at the pleasure of the governor. Unless otherwise provided, the governor may designate the chair of a board, and all the other officers shall be elected by the board members. Unless otherwise provided, officers of a board are the chair and the secretary. A board may provide by regulation that three or more unexcused absences from meetings are cause for removal.

Board of Certified Direct-Entry Midwives
<i>(As of June 30, 2002)</i>
Dana Brown, CDM, CPM, Chairperson
Marilyn Holmes, Secretary
Mark E. Richey, MD
Martha Linden, CDM
Sharon K. Evans, CDM

By statute, the board consists of five members. The five members are required to consist of two certified direct-entry midwives, one certified nurse midwife, one physician licensed by the Alaska State Medical Board who has an obstetrical practice or has specialized training in obstetrics, and one public member. Once appointed, the members serve staggered terms of four years.

Duties of the board

The board's responsibilities under AS 08.65.030 include:

1. Examining applicants and issuing certificates to those applicants it finds qualified;
2. Adopting regulations establishing certification and certificate renewal requirements;
3. Issuing permits to apprentice direct-entry midwives;
4. Holding hearings and ordering the disciplinary sanction of a person who violates statute or regulation regarding direct-entry midwives;
5. Supplying forms for applications, licenses, permits, certificates, and other papers and records;
6. Reporting annually to the governor and the Department of Community and Economic Development (DCEC) on the board's proceedings during the year;
7. Approving curricula and adopting standards for basic education, training, and apprentice programs; and
8. Approving education, training, and apprentice programs that meet the requirements of statute and the board, and denying, revoking, or suspending approval of programs that fail to meet the requirements.

Department of Community and Economic Development

DCEC provides administrative and investigative assistance to the board (AS 08.01.050). Licensing and application fees, as appropriated by the legislature, fund this assistance. Administrative assistance includes budgetary services and functions such as: collecting fees, maintaining files, receiving and issuing application forms, and publishing notice of examinations and meetings.

DCEC is empowered with the authority to act on its own initiative, or in response to a complaint. DCEC may:

1. Conduct an investigation if it appears a person is engaged in, or is about to engage in, a practice over which DCEC has authority.
2. Issue an order that the person stop the practice.
3. Bring an action in superior court to enjoin the act.
4. Examine the books and records of an individual.
5. Issue subpoenas for the attendance of witnesses and records.

REPORT CONCLUSIONS

In our opinion, the termination date for the Board of Certified Direct-Entry Midwives should be extended. The regulation and licensing of qualified direct-entry midwives contributes to the protection of the public's health, safety, and welfare. Women seeking to give birth through the use of midwives rely on the diligence of the board and staff to promote the provision of quality midwifery services.

The board serves this public interest by establishing minimum educational and work experience requirements that individuals must meet in order to become a certified direct-entry midwife. The board further serves this public interest by investigating complaints against certified professionals and taking disciplinary action when appropriate. The board has carried out its responsibilities in a manner consistent with statutes, good administrative practice, and the public interest.

The board has served as a means to make people practicing midwifery aware of the level of experience and education expected of them. Also, by having a board, individuals that practice midwifery can now be held accountable to an established standard of care. The board has displayed its ability to conduct its business in a professional, competent, and efficient manner. The board continues to propose changes to statute and regulation to improve its effectiveness.

AS 08.03.010(c)(8) requires the Board of Certified Direct-Entry Midwives be terminated on June 30, 2003. Under AS 08.03.020, the board has one year in which to conclude its administrative operations. Based upon our review of the operations of the Board of Certified Direct-Entry Midwives over the past three fiscal years, we recommend the legislature extend the board's termination date to June 30, 2007.

(Intentionally left blank)

ANALYSIS OF PUBLIC NEED

The following analyses of board activities relate to the public need factors defined in AS 44.66.050. These analyses are not intended to be comprehensive, but address those areas we were able to cover within the scope of our review.

Determine the extent to which the board has operated in the public interest.

The Board of Certified Direct-Entry Midwives (CDM) has served the public interest by examining and licensing qualified applicants, and by proposing changes to statute and regulation in order to enhance the quality of midwifery care in Alaska.

The board developed regulations to establish a peer review committee to review birth summaries and other required medical records to determine if a certified midwife acted in accordance with governing CDM regulations and statutes.

The board developed a four-page handbook for applicants, licensees, new board members, and other interested individuals. After receiving input from the public, the board has decided to revise the handbook, and is currently considering changes and additions.

At the conclusion of the last sunset review, high fees were considered a barrier to entry. The board has pursued various strategies in reducing the necessary fees and has been able to lower the license renewal fee to the current \$950.

The board worked with the State of Alaska to establish Medicaid procedures for CDM services, thereby placing Alaska among eight states which both license their traditional midwives and provide Medicaid reimbursement for their services.

After much discussion regarding the licensing of foreign-trained applicants, the board decided that it was in the profession's and the public's best interest to require foreign-trained applicants to meet the established standards when applying for licensure in Alaska.

The board believes it would be in the public's best interest to require licensing of birth centers (currently they are only required to register with the State) and has sought support for such legislation.

Determine the extent to which the operation of the board has been impeded or enhanced by existing statutes, procedures, and practices, which it has adopted, and any other matter, including budgetary, resource, and personnel matters.

Since its inception, a major issue for the board has been the amount of licensing fees charged to license holders. Currently, certified midwives pay a biennial licensing fee of \$950. This

amount represents a reduction from \$1,550 charged to midwives in the previous two-year licensing period.

These fees result from the language of the general licensing statutes at AS 08.01.065(c), which require "*...that the total amount of fees collected for an occupation approximately equals the actual regulatory costs for the occupation.*" Much of the high fees midwives pay can be attributed to high legal costs incurred by the board in developing the first set of professional regulations, and participating in a lawsuit involved with alleged unlicensed practice.

Another factor in the high fees is the relatively small number of certified midwives licensed by the State. As of July 2002, there were 25 licensed midwives and eight apprentices licensed by the State. With this relatively small number of licensees, the board experiences substantial diseconomies of scale in trying to adequately fund effective professional oversight and regulation.

Board members have expressed concern that the high licensing fees have been a disincentive to individuals considering entry into the profession.

We reviewed the internal records maintained by the Division of Occupational Licensing related to revenues and expenditures associated with the Board of Certified Direct-Entry Midwives. We did not audit this information, and present it here for general information purposes. As the schedule on the opposite page reflects, the Board of Certified Direct-Entry Midwives is setting various fees for the occupations it regulates to sufficiently cover the costs of operating the board.

State of Alaska
 Board of Certified Direct-Entry Midwives
 Schedule of License Revenues and Board Expenditures
 FY 98 - FY 01
 (Unaudited)

	FY01	FY00	FY99	FY98
<i>Total Revenues:</i>	\$ 28,560	\$ 11,930	\$ 29,505	\$ 5,025
<i>Board/Occupation Direct Expenditures:</i>				
Personal Services	\$ 9,835	\$ 6,659	\$ 8,257	\$ 6,710
Travel (See Note)	3,946	3,463	310	2,562
Contractual	4,692	2,565	1,433	2,322
Supplies	2	20	73	21
<i>Total Board/Occupation Direct Expenditures</i>	\$ 18,475	\$ 12,707	\$ 10,073	\$ 11,615
<i>Total Administrative Indirect Expenditures</i>	1,086	703	839	981
<i>Total Direct and Indirect Expenditures</i>	\$ 19,561	\$ 13,410	\$ 10,912	\$ 12,596
<i>Revenues Compared to Expenditures</i>	\$ 8,999	\$ (1,480)	\$ 18,593	\$ (7,571)
<i>Cumulative Surplus or (Deficit) for Board Operations</i>	\$ 27,441	\$ 18,442	\$ 19,922	\$ 1,329

Note - The \$310 total for Travel costs in FY 99 appears to be in error. At the time of our report, the Division of Occupational Licensing was in the process of reviewing their records to determine what adjustment may be necessary to charge costs appropriately.

Determine the extent to which the board has recommended statutory changes that are generally of benefit to the public interest.

The board has primarily focused its administrative efforts on developing regulations to carry out its regulatory responsibilities related to midwifery. Over the past few years, the board has not spent any significant effort developing or supporting proposed legislation.

Determine the extent to which the board has encouraged interested persons to report to it concerning the effect of its regulations and decisions on the effectiveness of services, economy of service, and availability of services that it has provided.

The location, date, and time of board meetings are published in the appropriate prominent publications within the State. The Department of Law defines adequate public notice as advertising at least three days, excluding weekends and holidays, and ten days when possible, prior to a meeting. We reviewed advertising confirmations for the period under review, and the department's policy on public notice requirements, and found the board to be in full compliance with these public notice requirements.

In addition to the required public notices, the board also maintains a web site on the Internet that contains notices of regular board meetings, actions taken by the board, and proposed regulations.

Determine the extent to which the board has encouraged public participation in the making of its regulations and decisions.

Time is available at all public meetings for public testimony. The board also accepts and reviews written comments to be discussed at board meetings. On several occasions, this correspondence was from a member of the public, and involved issues before the board.

Determine the efficiency with which public inquiries or complaints regarding the activities of the board filed with it, with the department to which a board is administratively assigned, or with the Office of the Ombudsman have been processed and resolved.

For the 45 month period from June 1, 1998, through March 31, 2002, the only two cases involving midwives related to the activities of the same license holder. In February 2001, the individual was fined \$5,000 by the board when an audit revealed that she had not completed the continuing professional education (CPE) coursework she claimed to have taken. This coursework was necessary for license renewal. The board suspended \$4,000 of the fine, reprimanded the licensee, and suspended her license to practice until she came into compliance with the board's CPE requirements.

As a result of an investigation completed in June 2002, the board has summarily suspended the individual's license and reinstated the balance of the fine previously suspended.

There were no complaints filed with the Office of the Ombudsman for the period under review.

Determine the extent to which the board regulates entry into an occupation or profession and whether it has presented qualified applicants to serve the public.

Overall, the application process for certified direct-entry midwife licensure appears reasonable and appropriate. The board has issued twelve new CDM licenses since the last sunset audit. The licensing process is neither unduly restrictive nor too lax, and the board is presenting qualified applicants to serve the public.

The board discussed procedures for licensure of foreign-trained applicants and concluded that it was in the profession's and the public's best interest to require them to fulfill the same requirements as all other applicants.

As of the time of the review, the board had issued a total of 35 CDM licenses (currently 25 active), and 30 CDM-Apprentice permits (currently 7 active). This represents approximately double the number of licensed CDMs at the time of the last sunset audit.

New Certifications Issued	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	Total	Current Licenses as of June 30, 2002
Midwives	4	4	2	10	25
Apprentices	5	4	2	11	7

Determine the extent to which state personnel practices, including affirmative action requirements, have been complied with by the board to its own activities and the area of activity or interest.

We found no evidence that the board is not complying with state personnel practices, including affirmative action, in qualifying applicants.

Determine the extent to which statutory, regulatory, budgeting or other changes are necessary to enable the board to better serve the interest of the public and to comply with the factors enumerated in AS 44.66.050.

The board believes it is in the profession's and the public's best interest to require all CDM applicants and renewals to pass an exam on state statutes and regulations applicable to the profession. Currently, the board does not have statutory authority to make successful completion of such an examination a condition of licensure. The board has, however, developed a two-hour self-study course that all applicants and renewal applicants are encouraged to complete.

(Intentionally left blank)

Tony Knowles, Governor

Alaska **Department of Community
and Economic Development**

Division of Occupational Licensing

P.O. Box 110806, Juneau, AK 99811-0806

Telephone: (907) 465-2534 • Fax: (907) 465-2974 • Text Telephone: (907) 465-5437

Email: License@dced.state.ak.us • Website: www.dced.state.ak.us/occ/

September 24, 2002

Ms. Pat Davidson
Legislative Auditor
Division of Legislative Audit
Juneau, AK 99811

Dear Ms. Davidson,

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to the preliminary audit of the Board of Certified Direct- Entry Midwives.

The Division of Occupational Licensing agrees with the audit recommendation to extend the board until 2007. The licensing and regulation of midwives contributes significantly to public safety and health options. The board and staff do an excellent job.

Sincerely,

Catherine Reardon, Director

DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
OCCUPATIONAL LICENSING

EXPENDITURE AND REVENUE REPORT FOR THE BOARD OF DIRECT ENTRY MIDWIVES

September 23, 2002

Direct Entry Midwives <i>(In Thousands)</i>		FISCAL YEAR 2001	FISCAL YEAR 2002
PERSONAL SERVICES EXPENSES (71000)	Direct	9.8	14.6
	Indirect	0.6	0.6
Total:		\$10.4	\$15.2
Personal service expenses are employee salaries and benefits. In Fiscal Year 1994 the Division began using detailed time sheets to record actual time spent on the various licensing areas.			
TRAVEL EXPENSES (72000)	Direct	3.9	5.1
	Indirect	0.0	0.0
Total:		\$3.9	\$5.1
Travel expenses include transportation, food and lodging for board meetings, complaint investigations, disciplinary hearings and national meetings.			
CONTRACTUAL SERVICES EXPENSES (73000)	Direct	4.7	8.5
	Indirect	0.4	0.4
Total:		\$5.1	\$8.9
Contractual services are services purchased from sources outside the Division and include telephone calls, postage, expert witnesses, Department of Law legal work, and other costs.			
SUPPLIES EXPENSES (74000)	Direct	0.0	0.0
	Indirect	0.0	0.0
Total:		\$0.0	\$0.0
Supply expenses include paper, envelopes, cassette tapes, and other office supplies.			
EQUIPMENT EXPENSES(75000)	Direct	0.0	0.0
	Indirect	0.1	0.0
Total:		\$0.1	\$0.0
Equipment expenses include purchase and repair of computers, software, copy machines, telephones and other office equipment.			
	Total Direct:	\$18.4	\$28.2
	Total Indirect:	\$1.1	\$1.0
TOTAL EXPENSES:		\$19.5	\$29.2
TOTAL REVENUE:		28.6	7.7



J U N E A U
F A M I L Y B I R T H
C E N T E R

Juneau Family Birth Center

3225 Hospital Drive, Suite 106, Juneau, AK 99801 (907)586-1203

Midwives Association of Alaska
Kaye Kanne, CDM, President
P.O. Box 22256
Juneau, Ak 99802
907-586-1203

Representative Bruce Weyrauch
State Capitol, Room 427
Juneau, Ak 99801

January 29, 2003

Dear Representative Weyrauch,

Thank you for introducing HB 71, a bill to extend the Certified Direct-Entry Licensing Board. I had the privilege of sitting on the Board from its inception in 1992 through 1999. The Board has done an exemplary job of writing and implementing regulations for the governing of Certified Direct-Entry midwives in Alaska. The Board continues to strive for the highest standards for CDM's and as a result, midwives in Alaska are professional, well trained and provide safe, excellent care for women and families.

Alaska has one of the best midwifery laws in the United States. Many other states have looked to us as an example when passing midwifery legislation. Direct-Entry midwifery is increasingly recognized across the nation, with licensing for direct-entry midwives in 21 states, and legislation pending in 8 more states. Many more women are seeking the continuity of care and family centered maternity care which midwifery can provide.

The American Public Health Association endorses state regulated and national certified Direct-Entry midwives to improve outcomes while lowering healthcare costs for maternity care. They support efforts to increase access to out-of-hospital maternity care services, through recognition that Direct-Entry midwives can serve clients desiring, safe, planned out-of-hospital midwifery care.

Alaska is at the forefront of Direct-Entry midwifery licensing. Let's continue the excellent work we have been doing by continuing the Certified Direct-Entry licensing Board for another 4 years.

Sincerely,

Kaye Kanne, CDM, President
Midwives Association of Alaska

FISCAL NOTE

STATE OF ALASKA
2003 LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Fiscal Note Number: _____
 Bill Version: HB 71
 () Publish Date: _____

Revision Date/Time (Note if correction): _____ Dept. Affected: DCED
 Title An Act extending the termination date of the BRU Occupational Licensing (117)
Board of Certified Direct-Entry Midwives Component Occupational Licensing
 Sponsor House State Affairs
 Requester House Labor & Commerce Component No. 2360

Expenditures/Revenues (Thousands of Dollars)

Note: Amounts do not include inflation unless otherwise noted below.

OPERATING EXPENDITURES	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009
Personal Services	14.6	14.6	14.6	14.6	14.6	
Travel	5.1	5.1	5.1	5.1	5.1	
Contractual	8.5	8.5	8.5	8.5	8.5	
Supplies	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Equipment	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Land & Structures						
Grants & Claims						
Miscellaneous						
TOTAL OPERATING	28.2	28.2	28.2	28.2	28.2	0.0

CAPITAL EXPENDITURES						
-----------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

CHANGE IN REVENUES (1156)	28.2	28.2	28.2	28.2	28.2	
----------------------------------	-------------	-------------	-------------	-------------	-------------	--

FUND SOURCE (Thousands of Dollars)

1002 Federal Receipts						
1003 GF Match						
1004 GF						
1005 GF/Program Receipts						
1037 GF/Mental Health						
Other 1156- Receipt Supported Services	28.2	28.2	28.2	28.2	28.2	
TOTAL	28.2	28.2	28.2	28.2	28.2	0.0

Estimate of any current year (FY2003) cost: 28.2

Mark this box (X) if funding for this bill is included in the Governor's FY 2004 budget proposal:

POSITIONS

Full-time						
Part-time						
Temporary						

ANALYSIS: (Attach a separate page if necessary)

The bill extends the Board of Certified Direct-Entry Midwives to June 30, 2007. In accordance with AS 08.03.020, funding is extended one year following the termination date allowing the board to conclude its affairs. The information above identifies direct expenditure and revenue information included in the FY 2004 Operating Budget request. New funds are not required to implement this bill.

Prepared by: Jennifer Strickler, Administrative Manager
 Division: Occupational Licensing
 Approved by: Edgar Blatchford, Commissioner
 Agency: Department of Community & Economic Development

Phone (907) 465-2144
 Date/Time 2/10/03 12:00 PM
 Date 2/10/2003



J U N E A U
F A M I L Y B I R T H
C E N T E R

Juneau Family Birth Center

3225 Hospital Drive, Suite 106, Juneau, AK 99801 (907)586-1203

Midwives Association of Alaska
Kaye Kanne, CDM, President
C/O
Juneau Family Birth Center
Juneau, Ak 99802
907-586-1203

Honorable Representative William Williams
State Capitol, Room 511
Juneau, Ak 99801

February 17, 2003

Dear Representative Williams,

Thank you for supporting HB 71, a bill to extend the Certified Direct-Entry Licensing Board. I had the privilege of sitting on the Board from its inception in 1992 through 1999. The Board has done an exemplary job of writing and implementing regulations for the governing of Certified Direct-Entry midwives in Alaska. The Board continues to strive for the highest standards for CDM's and as a result, midwives in Alaska are professional, well trained and provide safe, excellent care for women and families.

Alaska has one of the best midwifery laws in the United States. Many other states have looked to us as an example when passing midwifery legislation. Direct-Entry midwifery is increasingly recognized across the nation, with licensing for direct-entry midwives in 21 states, and legislation pending in 8 more states. Many more women are seeking the continuity of care and family centered maternity care which midwifery can provide.

The American Public Health Association endorses state regulated and national certified Direct-Entry midwives to improve outcomes while lowering healthcare costs for maternity care. They support efforts to increase access to out-of-hospital maternity care services, through recognition that Direct-Entry midwives can serve clients desiring, safe, planned out-of-hospital midwifery care.

Alaska is at the forefront of Direct-Entry midwifery licensing. Let's continue the excellent work we have been doing by continuing the Certified Direct-Entry licensing Board for another 4 years.

Sincerely,

Kaye Kanne, CDM, President
Midwives Association of Alaska

Safety in Birth Begins With Midwifery Care

"In terms of quality, satisfaction, and costs, the midwifery model for pregnancy and maternity care has been found to be beneficial to women and families, resulting in good outcomes and cost savings. ... With its focus on pregnancy as a normal life event and health promotion for women of all ages, the midwifery model of care is an appropriate alternative or complement to the medical approach to childbirth."

American Public Health Association, "Supporting Access to Midwifery Services in the United States (Position Paper)", *American Journal of Public Health*, Vol. 91, No. 3, March 2001.

"It is inherently unwise, and perhaps unsafe, for women with normal pregnancies to be cared for by obstetric specialists ... Midwives and general practitioners, on the other hand, are primarily oriented to the care of women with normal pregnancies, and are likely to have more detailed knowledge of individual women."

Murray Enkin, et al, *A Guide to Effective Care in Pregnancy and Childbirth*. Oxford University Press, 2000.

"It is the finding and vision of the Taskforce that the midwifery model of care is an essential element of comprehensive health care for women and their families that should be embraced by, and incorporated into, the health care system and made available to all women."

Dower CM, Miller JE, O'Neil EH and the Taskforce on Midwifery, *Charting a Course for the 21st Century: The Future of Midwifery*. San Francisco, CA: Pew Health Professions Commission and the UCSF Center for the Health Professions. April 1999.

"Midwives are the most appropriate primary health care provider to be assigned to the care of normal birth."

Maternal and Newborn Health/Safe Motherhood Unit of the World Health Organization, *Care in Normal Birth: A practical guide*. World Health Organization, 1996.

"Midwives attend the vast majority of births in those industrialized countries with the best perinatal outcomes..."

Coalition for Improving Maternity Services, *The Mother-Friendly Childbirth Initiative*, 1996

The Safety of Home Birth

The evidence is overwhelming – planned home birth is safe for healthy women

“Recognizing the evidence that births to healthy mothers, who are not considered at medical risk after comprehensive screening by trained professionals, can occur safely in various settings, including out-of-hospital birth centers and homes ...Therefore, APHA Supports efforts to increase access to out-of-hospital maternity care services...”

American Public Health Association, “Increasing Access to Out-of-Hospital Maternity Care Services through State-Regulated and Nationally-Certified Direct-Entry Midwives (Policy Statement)”. *American Journal of Public Health*, Vol 92, No. 3, March 2002.

“Several methodologically sound observational studies have compared the outcomes of planned home-births (irrespective of the eventual place of birth) with planned hospital-births for women with similar characteristics. A meta-analysis of these studies showed no maternal mortality, and no statistically significant differences in perinatal mortality risk in either direction.”

Murray Enkin, et al, *A Guide to Effective Care in Pregnancy and Childbirth*. Oxford University Press, 2000.

“It is safe to say that a woman should give birth in a place where feels is safe, and at the most peripheral level at which appropriate care is feasible an safe. For a low-risk pregnant woman this can be at home, at a small maternity clinic or birth centre, in town or perhaps at the maternity unit of a larger hospital. However, it must be a place where all the attention and care are focused on her needs a safety, as close to home and her own culture as possible.

Maternal and Newborn Health/Safe Motherhood Unit of the World Health Organization, *Care in Normal Birth: A practical guide*. World Health Organization, 1996.

“Excellent outcomes with much lower intervention rates are achieved at home births. This may be because the overuse of interventions in hospital births introduces risks or the home environment promotes problem-free labors.”

Henci Goer, *Obstetric Myths versus Research Realities: A Guide to the Medical Literature*. Bergin & Garvey, 1995.

“This study supports previous research indicating that planned home birth with qualified care providers can be a safe alternative for healthy lower risk women.”

Anderson RE, Murphy PA. “Outcomes Of 11,788 Planned Home Births Attended By Certified Nurse-Midwives. A Retrospective Descriptive Study.” *Journal of Nurse Midwifery*, 1995 Nov-Dec;40(6):483-92. (Abst)

"Increasing Access To Out-Of-Hospital Maternity Care Services Through State-Regulated and Nationally-Certified Direct-Entry Midwives"

Formally adopted by the Governing Council of the American Public Health Association (APHA)
Wednesday, October 24, 2001

THE AMERICAN PUBLIC HEALTH ASSOCIATION,

Reaffirming its position on credentials for health occupations, that there should be alternative routes involving educational systems of selection and preparation, and legal systems of licensing by which people can prepare and qualify for health occupations (1)

Reaffirming its recognition that many women seek birthing alternatives(2) and,

Recognizing that pregnancy and birth are normal life events for a majority of women, (3,4,5) and,

Reaffirming its endorsement of the philosophy of family-centered maternity care, the importance of continuity of care, and the use of a variety of licensed care-givers, (6)

Recognizing that Direct-entry Midwives encompass a diverse group of midwives that have entered the profession directly through midwifery education and training, and not through a pre-requisite program such as nursing.(7)

Recognizing that there are alternative educational systems of selection and preparation for national certification of Direct entry Midwives that include either the Certified Professional Midwife (CPM) credential and the Certified Midwife (CM) credential; and that both require didactic programs, written examinations and clinical experience. (8,9) In the case of the Certified Professional Midwives the didactic component consists of education in a program accredited by an agency that is recognized by the US Department of Education or the PEP Program, the North American Registry of Midwives competency based, educational portfolio evaluation, and the clinical component is equivalent to one year of experience which includes more than a thousand contact hours under the supervision of one or more preceptors, some of which must be in out-of-hospital settings, but none of which need to be in hospital settings;(8) and in the case of the Certified Midwife (CM) credential requires education in institutions of higher learning accredited by an agency that is recognized by the US Department of Education to meet the same standards that Certified Nurse Midwives must meet, completing core science requirements similar to those required for a nurse, and fulfilling core midwifery requirements that are a part of all accredited nurse-midwifery education programs, and clinical experience that must include hospital experience, but is not required to include out-of-hospital experience.(9)

Recognizing that individual states interested in incorporating direct-entry midwives into their health care systems are moving towards regulatory models based on national certification.(5)

Recognizing evidence that many women seek alternatives to hospital care for normal pregnancy and birth, and,

Recognizing the evidence that births to healthy mothers, who are not considered at medical risk after comprehensive screening by trained professionals, can occur safely in various settings, including out-of-hospital birth centers and homes (10,11,12,13,14)and,

Noting that an epidemiological study of Certified Professional Midwives (CPMs) is ongoing in order to further substantiate practice outcomes, safety, client satisfaction, and practitioner competency is in progress; (15)

Recognizing that out-of-hospital settings have the potential for reducing the costs of maternity care; (7,12,16)

Recognizing evidence that access to quality maternity caregivers remains an important issue, particularly for underserved urban and rural communities;(17) which may be addressed through out-of-hospital maternity services in some communities; and

Reaffirming that the APHA currently recognizes the value of and promotes educational opportunities for nurse-midwifery,(18) and that many professionals recognize the contributions of direct-entry midwifery; and,

Reaffirming that APHA has been an innovator in public health care by supporting research on alternative and complementary medicine (1,19) and increased access to midwifery services in the United States, (20)

Recognizing that there should be alternative routes involving educational systems of selection and preparation, and legal systems of licensing by which people can prepare and qualify for health occupations, including those direct-entry midwives who are nationally-certified and who have successfully completed "a recognized midwifery education process"; (21,22,23,25) and

Recognizing evidence that direct-entry midwives have multiple educational routes (22,24) available to them in order to meet the entry-level requirements of knowledge, skills and experience; (22,24,25)

Recognizing evidence that individual states interested in incorporating direct-entry midwives into the health care system are moving towards regulatory models based on national certifications; (22)

Therefore, APHA

- Supports efforts to increase access to out-of-hospital maternity care services and increase the range of quality maternity care choices available to consumers, through recognition that legally-regulated and nationally certified direct-entry midwives can serve clients desiring safe, planned, out-of-hospital maternity care services, and further:
- Encourages the development and implementation of guidelines for the licensing, certification and practice for direct-entry midwifery practitioners for use by state and local health agencies, health planners, maternity care providers, and professional organizations;
- Urges that there be increased opportunities, for supervised, clinical learning experiences, in a variety of settings, including both high-risk and low-risk, incorporated into direct-entry midwifery education programs;
- Encourages an increase in cost effective maternal care services for rural and underserved urban populations by advocating for increases in funding of scholarships and loan repayment programs targeted at members of these communities;
- Urges public and private insurance plans to eliminate barriers to the reimbursement and equitable payment of direct-entry midwifery services in both public and private payment systems;
- Encourages the National Center for Health Statistics, the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services and State Vital Records Offices to add the CPM as a separate certifier category on birth certificates to enable routine collection of systematic data;
- Urges HRSA, CDC and state health departments to improve the collection and quality of vital statistics and other data to enhance the monitoring of birth outcomes (e.g., infant and perinatal mortality rates, maternal mortality rates, etc.) resulting from services provided by all practitioners including specific types of midwife practitioners;
- Urges Congress and appropriate Department of Health and Human Services agencies to increase funding and other support for ongoing research and evaluation of maternal health and birth outcomes, practice outcomes, quality of care outcomes, and safety related to the services provided by direct-entry midwives;

References:

1. American Public Health Association Policy Statement 6805: Credentials for Health Occupations. APHA Public Policy Statements, 1948 to present, cumulative. Washington, D.C. current volume.
2. American Public Health Association Position Paper 8209: Guidelines for Licensing and Regulating Birth Centers. APHA Public Policy Statements, 1948 to present, cumulative. Washington, D.C. current volume.
3. Stewart, David: The Five Standards of Safe Childbearing, NAPSAC International, 4th Edition, 1997.
4. Care in Normal Birth: a practical guide, Technical Working Group, World Health Organization. Department of Reproductive Health and Research, Section 1 1-1.6, 1999.
5. Rooks, JR: Midwifery and Childbirth in America. Temple University Press, Philadelphia, 1997.
6. American Public Health Association Position Paper 7924: Alternatives in Maternity Care APHA Public Policy Statements, 1948 to present, cumulative. Washington, D.C. current volume.
7. Rooks, JP. Unity in Midwifery? Realities and Alternatives. Journal of Nurse-Midwifery 1998; 43:315-19.
8. North American Registry of Midwives (NARM), How to Become a Certified Professional Midwife and Candidate Information Bulletin. Revised, June, 2000
9. ACNM Issue Brief February 1999 and ACNM Position Statement on Midwifery Education 1997

10. Durand AM: The safety of home birth: The Farm study. *Am J Public Health* 1992;82:450-453
11. MacDorman M, Singh G: Midwifery care, social and medical risk factors and birth outcomes in the USA. *J. Epidemiol Community Health* 1998, 52: 310-317.
12. Wagner M: Midwifery in the Industrialized world. *Journal of the Society of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists of Canada*, November 1998.
13. Mehl, LE, Ramiel, JR, Leininger, B., Hoff, B, Kroenthal, K, Peterson, G: Evaluation of Outcomes of non-nurse midwives: Matched comparison with physicians. *Women & Health* 1980;5:17-29
14. Sullivan D & Weitz: *Labor Pains: Modern Midwives and Homebirth*, Yale University Press, 1988.
15. Ken Johnson, PhD and Betty Ann Daviss, MA. CPM Statistics Project 2000: A prospective study of births by Certified Professional Midwives in North America. (Abstract #3042.0) Presented at 128th APHA Annual Meeting, Boston, MA, November 2000.
16. Blevins Medical Monopoly: Protecting Consumers or Limiting Competition? Policy Analysis by Cato Institute December 15, 1995; 246: 11-14. Burnette CA, Jones JA, SA:
17. Tennessee Commission on Children and Youth Report: *The State of the Child in Tennessee: KIDS COUNT*, 1996.
18. American Public Health Association Position Paper 9403: Increase Support for Education and Practice Opportunities for Nurse-Midwives, 1948 to Present, Cumulative, Washington, D.C.: American Public Health Association; current volume.
19. American Public Health Association Position Paper 9714: Support for Research on Alternative and Complementary Practices, 1948 to Present, Cumulative, Washington, D.C.: American Public Health Association; current volume.
20. American Public Health Association Position Paper 20004: Supporting Access to Midwifery Services in the United States, 1948 to Present, Cumulative, Washington, D.C.: American Public Health Association; current volume.
21. *Charting A Course for the 21st Century: The Future of Midwifery*. A Joint Report of the PEW Health Commission and the University of California, San Francisco Center for the Health Professions, April 1999.
22. Myers-Ciecko J: Evolution and Current Status of Direct-Entry Midwifery Education, Regulation, And Practice in the United States, with Examples from Washington State. *The Journal of Nurse-Midwifery*, Vol. 44, No. 4, July/Aug. 1999, pp 384-392.
23. *Midwifery Today. Paths To Becoming a Midwife: Getting an Education*, Midwifery Today, Inc. 1998.
24. Haughton P, Windom KL: 1995 Job Analysis of the Role of Direct-Entry Midwives. June 1996.
25. Mahlman R. *The Quality of the NARM Certification Process*, Testimony before the Ohio Study Council on Midwifery, Associate Director of Assessment Services, Vocational Instructional Materials Laboratory, The Ohio State University, July 1997

Resolution Submitted by:

Sharon Wells, MS, LM, CPM
 Carol Nelson, LM, CPM
 Jonathan B. Kotch, MD, MPH
 Stanley H. Weiss, MD, FACP
 James Gaudino, MD, MS, MPH

Overview of Maternity Care in the US

Carolyn Keefe, MLS

With four million births each year¹ and three-quarters of American women becoming mothers, maternity care affects large numbers of women. It is also big business. The United States has the highest per capita spending on health care in the world, with maternity care ranking sixth overall,² and childbirth is the most common reason for the hospitalization of women in the United States.

Women are subjected to an ever-increasing array of interventions and technologies, many of which are highly invasive, with little or no evidence of their effectiveness. In fact, the medical evidence shows that the routine use of unnecessary interventions put mothers and babies at risk. Medical interventions are also expensive and often used not for the benefit of women and babies, but for the convenience or legal protection of doctors and hospitals.

All of this would be acceptable if we had better outcomes to show for it. Unfortunately, our outcomes are not nearly as good as those of developed countries that rely more heavily on midwifery care. Some of the clear problems with our maternity care system include:

- A high infant mortality rate compared to other developed countries – 27th in the world³ – infant mortality rates are higher for African American, Latina and Native American babies – with the rate for African American babies twice that of white babies.⁴
- A maternal mortality rate that has not improved in 20 years – 15th in the world.⁵ Maternal mortality is higher for women of color than for white women, nearly four times higher for African American women.⁶
- A cesarean birth rate of 24.4% – among the highest in the world. Cesarean birth rates are highest for African American women, followed by white women, Latina women, Asian women, and Native American women.⁷
- A 20% drop in vaginal births after cesarean (VBAC) from 2000 to 2001 to 16.4% – access to VBAC is disappearing requiring many women who have cesarean scars to undergo surgery.⁸
- An induction rate of 20.5% – which has more than doubled since 1989 and continues to rise.⁹
- Many mothers traumatized by their treatment during birth, with as many as 30% exhibiting some signs of post-traumatic stress disorder¹⁰ and 50% experiencing some aspect of postpartum depression (the highest such rate in the world).¹¹

Moreover:

- Of the eight most common surgical procedures in the US, four are obstetric in nature – episiotomy, repair of obstetric laceration, cesarean birth, artificial rupture of membranes. These are in also the top four surgeries performed on women in the US.¹²
- Obstetric procedures are the most common type of surgical procedures performed in the US (6,174,000), slightly higher than cardiac procedures (6,133,000). Consider the following:
 - obstetric procedures are only performed on women – more obstetric procedures are performed on women than the next two categories (cardiac and digestive) combined;
 - there are over six million obstetric procedures, but just over four million births;
 - these procedures are primarily performed on healthy bodies during a normal physiological process.

Fact Sheet

The problem has steadily gotten worse over the last two decades. All obstetric procedures combined nearly doubled between 1980 and 1999, while certain procedures, such as medical induction of labor, vacuum extraction, and manually assisted delivery increased eleven-fold in that time.¹³ Each procedure carries with it risks to mothers and babies, and less invasive techniques exist for most of them. Furthermore, they are usually not medically necessary and are avoidable for the majority of women.

The Midwives Model of Care¹⁴ and the evidence-based Mother-Friendly Childbirth Initiative¹⁵ recognize birth as a normal, natural process and support the use of less invasive techniques, such as position changes, waiting, hydrotherapy, and perineal support, that carry fewer risks to mothers and babies and are usually more effective.

Research shows that midwives are the safest birth attendants for most women, with lower infant and maternal mortality rates and fewer invasive interventions such as episiotomies and surgical births (cesareans). In developed countries where midwives are the primary care providers for pregnant women, mortality and surgical birth rates are much lower than in the United States. However, legal, regulatory, and financial barriers to the practicing the Midwives Model of Care and Mother-Friendly care make it difficult for women to access either in the US.

References:

¹ Martin, Joyce, et al, "Births Final Data for 2001," *National Vital Statistics Reports*, Vol 51, No. 5, December 18, 2002, p. 1

² 1999 National Statistics, HCUPnet, Healthcare Cost and Utilization Project. Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality, Rockville, MD. <http://www.ahrq.gov/data/hcup/hcupnet.htm>.

³ *Child Health USA 2001*, Maternal Child Health Bureau, Health Resources and Services Administration, US Department of Health and Human Services, p. 22.

⁴ Hoyert, DL; et al, "Deaths: Final Data for 1999," *National Vital Statistics Report*, Vol. 49, No. 8, September 21, 2001, p. 11.

⁵ *State of the World's Mothers 2002*, Save the Children, http://www.savethechildren.org/mothers/sowm02/report/complete_index.pdf.

⁶ Hoyert, DL; et al, "Deaths: Final Data for 1999," *National Vital Statistics Report*, Vol. 49, No. 8, September 21, 2001, p. 89.

⁷ Martin, Joyce, et al, "Births Final Data for 2001," *National Vital Statistics Reports*, Vol 51, No. 5, December 18, 2002, p. 16

⁸ Martin, Joyce, et al, "Births Final Data for 2001," *National Vital Statistics Reports*, Vol 51, No. 5, December 18, 2002, p. 16

⁹ Martin, Joyce, et al, "Births Final Data for 2001," *National Vital Statistics Reports*, Vol 51, No. 5, December 18, 2002, p. 15

¹⁰ Creedy DK, Shocher IM, Horsfall J. "Childbirth and the development of acute trauma symptoms: incidence and contributing factors." *Birth*, 2001 Jun; 27(2):104-11

¹¹ Wolf, Naomi, *Misconceptions: Truth, Lies, and the Unexpected on the Journey to Motherhood*. Doubleday, 2001, p. 216.

¹² Popovic JR. "1999 National Hospital Discharge Survey: Annual Summary with detailed diagnosis and procedure data," *Vital Health Statistics* 13(51). 2001, p. 35.

¹³ IBID, p. 46.

¹⁴ Developed in 1996 by Midwifery Task Force, www.midwiferytaskforce.org.

¹⁵ Developed in 1996 by the Coalition for Improving Maternity Services, www.mother-friendly.org.

* Reflects 2001 data.

Reprinted with permission from BirthNet.



AMERICAN PUBLIC HEALTH ASSOCIATION

Increasing Access to Out-of-Hospital Maternity Care Services through State-Regulated and Nationally-Certified Direct-Entry Midwives

01/01/2001
20013

THE AMERICAN PUBLIC HEALTH ASSOCIATION,

Reaffirming its position on credentials for health occupations, that there should be alternative routes involving educational systems of selection and preparation, and legal systems of licensing by which people can prepare and qualify for health occupations¹; and

Reaffirming its recognition that many women seek birthing alternatives²; and
Recognizing that pregnancy and birth are normal life events for a majority of women^{3,4,5}; and

Reaffirming its endorsement of the philosophy of family-centered maternity care, the importance of continuity of care, and the use of a variety of licensed care-givers⁶; and
Recognizing that Direct-entry Midwives encompass a diverse group of midwives that have entered the profession directly through midwifery education and training, and not through a prerequisite program such as nursing⁷; and

Recognizing that there are alternative educational systems of selection and preparation for national certification of Direct-entry Midwives that include either the Certified Professional Midwife (CPM) credential and the Certified Midwife (CM) credential; and that both require didactic programs, written examinations and clinical experience.^{8,9} In the case of the Certified Professional Midwives the didactic component consists of education in a program accredited by an agency that is recognized by the US Department of Education or the Portfolio Evaluation Process program, the North American Registry of Midwives competency-based, educational portfolio evaluation, and the clinical component is equivalent to one year of experience which includes more than a thousand contact hours under the supervision of one or more preceptors, some of which must be in out-of-hospital settings, but none of which need to be in hospital settings⁸; and in the case of the CM credential requires education in institutions of higher learning accredited by an agency that is recognized by the US Department of Education to meet the same standards that Certified Nurse Midwives must meet, completing core science requirements similar to those required for a nurse, and fulfilling core midwifery requirements that are a part of all accredited nurse-midwifery education programs, and clinical experience that must include hospital experience, but is not required to include out-of-hospital experience.⁹

Recognizing that individual states interested in incorporating direct-entry midwives into their health care systems are moving toward regulatory models based on national certification⁵; and

Recognizing evidence that many women seek alternatives to hospital care for normal pregnancy and birth, and

Recognizing the evidence that births to healthy mothers, who are not considered at medical risk after comprehensive screening by trained professionals, can occur safely in various settings, including out-of-hospital birth centers and homes¹⁰⁻¹⁴; and

Noting that an epidemiological study of Certified Professional Midwives (CPMs) is ongoing in order to investigate and evaluate practice outcomes, safety, client satisfaction, and practitioner competency¹⁵; and

Recognizing that out-of-hospital settings have the potential for reducing the costs of maternity care^{7,12,16}; and

Recognizing evidence that access to quality maternity care providers remains an important issue, particularly for underserved urban and rural communities¹⁷; which may be addressed through out-of-hospital maternity services in some communities; and

Reaffirming that the APHA currently recognizes the value of and promotes educational

opportunities for nurse-midwifery,¹⁸ and that many professionals recognize the contributions of direct-entry midwifery; and

Reaffirming that APHA has been an innovator in public health care by supporting research on alternative and complementary medicine^{1,19} and increased access to midwifery services in the United States,²⁰

Recognizing that there should be alternative routes involving educational systems of selection and preparation, and legal systems of licensing by which people can prepare and qualify for health occupations, including those direct-entry midwives who are nationally-certified and who have successfully completed "a recognized midwifery education process"^{21-23,25}; and

Recognizing evidence that direct-entry midwives have multiple educational routes^{22,24} available to them in order to meet the entry-level requirements of knowledge, skills and experience^{22,24,25};

Recognizing evidence that individual states interested in incorporating direct-entry midwives into the health care system are moving toward regulatory models based on national certifications²²;

Therefore, APHA

1. Supports efforts to increase access to out-of-hospital maternity care services and increase the range of quality maternity care choices available to consumers, through recognition that legally-regulated and nationally certified direct-entry midwives can serve clients desiring safe, planned, out-of-hospital maternity care services, and further;
2. Encourages the development and implementation of guidelines for the licensing, certification and practice for direct-entry midwifery practitioners for use by state and local health agencies, health planners, maternity care providers, and professional organizations;
3. Urges that there be increased opportunities for supervised clinical learning experiences, in a variety of settings, including both high-risk and low-risk, incorporated into direct-entry midwifery education programs;
4. Encourages an increase in cost effective maternal care services for rural and underserved urban populations by advocating for increases in funding of scholarships and loan repayment programs targeted at members of these communities;
5. Urges public and private insurance plans to eliminate barriers to the reimbursement and equitable payment of direct-entry midwifery services in both public and private payment systems;
6. Encourages the National Center for Health Statistics, the US Department of Health and Human Services and State Vital Records Offices to add the CPM as a separate certifier category on birth certificates to enable routine collection of systematic data;
7. Urges HRSA, CDC and state health departments to improve the collection and quality of vital statistics and other data to enhance the monitoring of birth outcomes (e.g., infant and perinatal mortality rates, maternal mortality rates, etc.) resulting from services provided by all practitioners including specific types of midwife practitioners;
8. Urges Congress and appropriate Department of Health and Human Services agencies to increase funding and other support for ongoing research and evaluation of maternal health and birth outcomes, practice outcomes, quality of care outcomes, and safety related to the services provided by direct-entry midwives.

References

1. American Public Health Association Policy Statement 6805: Credentials for Health Occupations. APHA Public Policy Statements, 1948 to present, cumulative. Washington, D.C. current volume.
2. American Public Health Association Position Paper 8209: Guidelines for Licensing and regulating Birth Centers. APHA Public Policy Statements, 1948 to present, cumulative. Washington, D.C. current volume.
3. Stewart, David: The Five Standards of Safe Childbearing, NAPSAC International, 4th Edition, 1997.
4. Care in Normal Birth: a practical guide, Technical Working Group, World Health Organization. Department of Reproductive Health and Research, Section 1.1-1.6, 1999.
5. Rooks, JR: Midwifery and Childbirth in America. Temple University Press, Philadelphia, 1997.
6. American Public Health Association Position Paper 7924: Alternatives in Maternity Care. APHA Public Policy Statements, 1948 to present, cumulative. Washington, D.C. current volume.

7. Rooks JP. Unity in Midwifery? Realities and Alternatives. *J Nurse-Midwifery* 1998;43:315-319.
8. North American Registry of Midwives (NARM), How to Become a Certified Professional Midwife and Candidate Information Bulletin. Revised, June 2000.
9. ACNM Issue Brief February 1999 and ACNM Position Statement on Midwifery Education 1997.
10. Durand AM. The safety of home birth: The Farm Study. *Am J Public Health* 1992;82:450-453.
11. MacDorman M, Singh G: Midwifery care, social and medical risk factors and birth outcomes in the USA. *J Epidemiol Community Health*. 1998;52:310-317.
12. Wagner M. Midwifery in the industrialized world. *J Soc Obstet Gyn Canada*. November 1998.
13. Mehl LE, Ramiel JR, Leininger B, Hoff B, Kroenthal K, Peterson G. Evaluation of outcomes of non-nurse midwives: matched comparison with physicians. *Women & Health* 1980;5:17-29.
14. Sullivan D, Weitz : *Labor Pains: modern midwives and homebirth*. Yale University Press, 1988.
15. Ken Johnson, PhD, and Betty Ann Daviss, MA. CPM Statistics Project 2000: A prospective study of births by certified professional midwives in North America. (Abstract #3042.0) Presented at 128th APHA Annual Meeting, Boston, MA, November 2000.
16. Blevins Medical Monopoly: Protecting Consumers or Limiting Competition? Policy Analysis by Cato Institute December 15, 1995;246:11-14. Burnette CA, Jones JA, SA.
17. Tennessee Commission on Children and Youth Report: The State of the Child in Tennessee: KIDS COUNT, 1996.
18. American Public Health Association Position Paper 9403: Increase support for education and practice opportunities for nurse-midwives. APHA Public Policy Statements, 1948 to present, cumulative. Washington, D.C. current volume.
19. American Public Health Association Position Paper 9714: Support for Research on Alternative and Complementary Practices. APHA Public Policy Statements, 1948 to present, cumulative. Washington, D.C. current volume.
20. American Public Health Association Position Paper 20004: Supporting Access to Midwifery Services in the United States. APHA Public Policy Statements, 1948 to present, cumulative. Washington, D.C. current volume.
21. Charting a course for the 21st century: The future of Midwifery. A joint report of the PEW Health Commission and the University of California, San Francisco Center for the Health Professions, April 1999.
22. Myers-Ciecko J. Evolution and current status of direct-entry midwifery education, regulation, and practice in the United States, with examples from Washington State. *J Nurse-Midwifery*, 1999(Jul-Aug);44(4):384-392.
23. *Midwifery Today*. Paths to becoming a midwife: Getting an Education, Midwifery Today, Inc. 1998.
24. Haughton P, Windom KL. 1995 Job Analysis of the role of direct-entry midwives. June 1996.
25. Mahlman R. The Quality of the NARM Certification process, testimony before the Ohio Study Council on Midwifery, Associate Director of Assessment Services, Vocational Instructional Materials Laboratory, The Ohio State University, July 1997.

Additional Info.

<http://www.apha.org/legislative/policy/policysearch/index.cfm?fuseaction=year>

[New Search](#) | [Back to APHA Home Page](#)

THE
FOLLOWING
DOCUMENT(S)
ARE
POOR
ORIGINAL
COPIES


The five nations with the world's lowest infant mortality rates have midwives attending 70% of all births without a physician in the birth room.

These nations also have the lowest rates of technological intervention including c-sections.



Contact your midwife at:

For more information or to request a free midwifery information kit call toll free at:
1-888-290-1091



Midwives Association of Alaska (MAA)

2650 Broadview Ave.
Wasilla, AK 99654

For a Free Information Kit
Call Toll Free: 1-888-290-1091

CDM MEANS "CERTIFIED DIRECT-ENTRY MIDWIFE"



TRUST
YOUR
BODY
&
YOUR
BABY



Choose
Midwifery
for a Safe

©1998 Midwives Association of Alaska

Is Midwifery

Why Alaskan Families Choose Midwifery

- Midwifery's excellent safety record
- Reclaiming birth as a natural process
- Continuity of woman centered care
- Father and sibling involvement and potential for family bonding
- Ability to give birth in a safe, familiar, comforting place
- Avoiding drugs which may affect one's baby in the birth process
- Confidence that labor and delivery plans will be honored
- Exposure to research linking natural birth experiences with psychological health
- Midwifery's low statistics for interventions, especially c-sections
- Realizing the potential to tap one's own instincts and avoid interference in the normal birth process
- Recommendation by friends & family
- Water birth options
- Considerable cost savings



What is a CDM?

Certified Direct-Entry Midwives (CDMs) are licensed experts in natural childbirth who monitor the physical, psychological and social well-being of the mother throughout the childbearing cycle.

Midwifery: Questions & Answers

Q: Are Alaska's CDMs licensed?

A: Yes. CDM's are licensed by a state regulatory board which sets standards for their education, apprenticeship, examination, and on-going review. The Board of Direct-Entry Midwives consists of two CDMs, one nurse mid-wife, one MD with an obstetrical practice and one public member.

Q: What exactly does a CDM offer to expecting mothers?

A: Individualized education and counseling, pre-natal care, continuous hands-on assistance during labor and delivery, post-partum support, and help with

Q: What are the benefits of delivering your baby with a CDM at home or in a midwifery birth center?

A: This experience maximizes the potential for the physical and psychological health of the mother and the newborn, supports maternal and family bonding and establishes a successful breast-feeding experience.

Q: What does the word 'midwife' mean?

A: Midwife means "with woman". CDM's work in partnership with child-bearing women, helping them claim the responsibility for decision making with regard to themselves and their

help women avoid the use of routine obstetrical interventions such as labor induction, IV's, anesthetics and episiotomies.

Q: How can using a midwife result in a considerable cost savings?

A: CDM services are among the most affordable professional services available for Alaska's childbearing families and are covered by medical insurance. Because cesarean section rates are extremely low with Alaskan CDMs and the mothers and babies are so healthy, there are many long-term savings as well for this model maternity care.





Midwives Model of Care



Appropriate Monitoring

- Regular and thorough check-ups for you and your baby throughout your pregnancy, during labor, and after the birth, to make sure both of you are healthy and doing well.
- Recommendations for diagnostic technology when appropriate.
- Planning with you for the unexpected and for the rare emergency.
- Referrals to other health care specialists or to a different birth setting if needed.
- Expertise in normal, natural childbirth. Because they are experts in normal pregnancy and birth, midwives are experienced in the variations of normal birth and recognize the early signs of conditions that are not "normal," including medical conditions or complications that may occasionally arise during pregnancy or the birth process.

Care Provider Who Stays With You

- Attentive, sensitive care and emotional support remain with you throughout labor. Research has shown that having a "sympathetic female companion" with you all through labor and delivery reduces the chance of complications and the likelihood of an unnecessary cesarean section. The Midwives Model of Care means that your midwife stays with you and "mothers the mother."
- Post-partum care and help with breastfeeding. After your baby is born, the midwife will stay with you until breastfeeding is established and both you and your baby are resting comfortably. She will arrange a visit after the birth to check you and your baby and to answer any questions.

Personal Attention

- Prenatal visits that allow plenty of time for questions and answers – 30 to 60 minutes for each prenatal appointment is common.
- Meaningful discussions to explore and help resolve fears and concerns you or your family may have.
- Caring attention to develop a trusting and nurturing relationship with you and your family that can help you to labor and give birth naturally and safely.

Confidence in Your Body

- Help with discovering your own body's ability to give birth, in its own way and in its own time.
- No routine treatments or arbitrary timetables that can interfere with your body's healthy process of laboring and giving birth.
- Truly individualized care, privacy and natural childbirth.
- Support for doing the work of giving birth. Rather than someone else "delivering" the baby, you are empowered to give birth to your own baby yourself!

Will you receive the Midwives Model of Care from your midwife or doctor? Use this information to ask detailed questions when choosing your caregiver and deciding where you want to give birth. It's also a good idea to question others who have used the caregiver. At present, this degree of individualized and supportive care is most typically provided by midwives in homes and birth centers. Someday, this kind of care will be available in all settings.

What to Expect from a Caregiver who provides the Midwives Model of Care:



Respectful Treatment

- Gentle, nurturing care that respects you, your family and your beliefs.
- Respect for your informed decisions about medical tests, recommendations and interventions.
- Willingness to support your birth plan including any family members and friends you may have present at the birth.
- Freedom to move, eat, bathe, to do whatever you desire during labor and birth; your midwife does not obstruct or allow, but patiently supports and guides you.
- Respect for the birth process as it unfolds uniquely each time. Although amazing, being pregnant and giving birth are actually normal life processes for which a woman's body is well-designed. Each woman's experience is unique.
- Respectful care regardless of setting, although at present this kind of care is most readily found in homes and birth centers.

Plenty of Information

- Plenty of information about pregnancy, birth and the newborn, and about breastfeeding and newborn care.
- Suggestions about ways you can take good care of yourself and your baby.
- Encouragement and practical suggestions for you to have good nutrition and make healthy lifestyle choices.
- Full information about any recommended tests, procedures or treatments so you can make informed choices about your care.

Natural Techniques for Comfort

- Help you cope with the discomfort of labor. Midwives have found that encouragement, massage, relaxation, laboring in water, changing positions, and other approaches are often very effective.
- Encourage the progress of labor and help you give birth to your baby gently and lovingly.
- Help you avoid risks (to yourself and to your baby) that are associated with many standard medical techniques and hospital protocols.




Midwives
Model of Care

The Midwives Model of Care is based on the fact that pregnancy and birth are normal life processes.

The Midwives Model of Care includes:

- monitoring the physical, psychological and social well-being of the mother throughout the childbearing cycle;
- providing the mother with individualized education, counseling, and prenatal care, continuous hands-on assistance during labor and delivery, and postpartum support;
- minimizing technological interventions; and
- identifying and referring women who require obstetrical attention.

The application of this woman-centered model of care has been proven to reduce the incidence of birth injury, trauma and cesarean section.

© May 1996, Midwifery Task Force, All Rights Reserved.


Midwives
Model of Care

Personal,

Practical and

Professional



Citizens for Midwifery

Learn, Connect, and Take Action

The goal of Citizens for Midwifery is to see that the Midwives Model of Care is available to all childbearing women and universally recognized as the best kind of care for pregnancy and birth. Citizens for Midwifery also endorses the Mother-Friendly Childbirth Initiative.

Citizens for Midwifery

1-888-236-4880

PO Box 82227

Athens, GA 30608

www.cfmwifery.org

Midwives Model of Care

www.midwivesmodelofcare.org

Congratulations!

*You are about to experience
the birth of your baby!*

Women in the United States are learning that pregnancy and childbirth are normal, healthy processes, not diseases. They are finding out that they and their families can benefit from the care of a midwife.

The Midwives Model of Care includes prenatal visits and "hands-on" care throughout labor, birth and right after. It results in less chance of complications, fewer interventions, and a healthier birth for you and for your baby.

Women are discovering that the hospital is not the only option for safe birth. Women are most likely to labor best in a place where they feel free, safe and private, with attendants whom they know and trust.

Many women find that they feel most comfortable at home or in a birth center, with the ongoing attention and nurturing care of a midwife or doctor trained in gentle, natural, safe childbirth—someone who is an expert in normal birth and provides the Midwives Model of Care.



Pregnancy and childbirth involve every part of you. Feelings, hopes, tears, physical and practical needs, and spiritual or religious beliefs can all affect your pregnancy and birth. A midwife providing the Midwives Model of Care addresses all of these aspects to help you give birth naturally, safely and confidently. In addition, women who experience this type of care report feelings of great satisfaction and empowerment!

Compared to standard medical management, the Midwives Model of Care is a fundamentally different approach to pregnancy and childbirth.

This pamphlet explains what to expect with the Midwives Model of Care, and how the kind of care can help make your childbirth experience a joyous life event.

HB

71

SFIN

FILE

SENATE FINANCE COMMITTEE REPORT

DATE: 2/26/03

REPORTED OUT

MAR 31 2003

SENATE FINANCE
COMMITTEE
HOUSE BILL NO. 71

FURTHER:

DATE TURNED
IN TO OFFICE: 3/31/03

Finance Committee considered

HB 71 EXTEND BOARD OF MIDWIVES

"An Act extending the termination date of the Board of Certified Direct-Entry Midwives."

and recommends:

- be replaced with S CS HB 71 (FIN)
- adopt previous CS CS Forthcoming ()
- attached amendment(s)
- adopt Letter of Intent by _____ Committee
- further referral to _____ Committee

Senate Bill:

- same title
- new title

House Bill:

- same title
- technical title
- new: SCR # _____

NEW FISCAL NOTE(S):

Department	Date	Fiscal	Zero	FN#

PREVIOUS FISCAL NOTE(S):

Department	Date	Fiscal	Zero	FN#
DCED	2/10/03	28.2		1

APPROPRIATION - no fiscal note

SIGNATURES AND RECOMMENDATIONS:	DO PASS	DO NOT PASS	NO REC	AMEND
<i>[Signature]</i>	✓			
<i>[Signature]</i>	✓			
<i>[Signature]</i>	✓			
<i>[Signature]</i>	✓			
<i>[Signature]</i>	✓			
COCHAIR: <i>[Signature]</i>	✓			
COCHAIR: <i>[Signature]</i>				

MAR 31 2003

SENATE FINANCE
COMMITTEE

FISCAL NOTE

STATE OF ALASKA
2003 LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Fiscal Note Number: 1
Bill Version: HB 71
(H) Publish Date: 2/12/03

Revision Date/Time (Note if correction):
Title An Act extending the termination date of the Board of Certified Direct-Entry Midwives Dept. Affected: DCED
Sponsor House State Affairs BRU Occupational Licensing (117)
Requester House Labor & Commerce Component Occupational Licensing
Component No. 2360

Expenditures/Revenues (Thousands of Dollars)

Note: Amounts do not include inflation unless otherwise noted below.

OPERATING EXPENDITURES	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009
Personal Services	14.6	14.6	14.6	14.6	14.6	
Travel	5.1	5.1	5.1	5.1	5.1	
Contractual	8.5	8.5	8.5	8.5	8.5	
Supplies	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Equipment	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Land & Structures						
Grants & Claims						
Miscellaneous						
TOTAL OPERATING	28.2	28.2	28.2	28.2	28.2	0.0

CAPITAL EXPENDITURES						
-----------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

CHANGE IN REVENUES (1156)	28.2	28.2	28.2	28.2	28.2	
----------------------------------	-------------	-------------	-------------	-------------	-------------	--

FUND SOURCE (Thousands of Dollars)

1002 Federal Receipts						
1003 GF Match						
1004 GF						
1005 GF/Program Receipts						
1037 GF/Mental Health						
Other 1156- Receipt Supported Services	28.2	28.2	28.2	28.2	28.2	
TOTAL	28.2	28.2	28.2	28.2	28.2	0.0

Estimate of any current year (FY2003) cost: 28.2
Mark this box (X) if funding for this bill is included in the Governor's FY 2004 budget proposal:

POSITIONS

Full-time						
Part-time						
Temporary						

ANALYSIS: (Attach a separate page if necessary)

The bill extends the Board of Certified Direct-Entry Midwives to June 30, 2007. In accordance with AS 08.03.020, funding is extended one year following the termination date allowing the board to conclude its affairs. The information above identifies direct expenditure and revenue information included in the FY 2004 Operating Budget request. New funds are not required to implement this bill.

Prepared by: Jennifer Strickler, Administrative Manager Phone (907) 465-2144
Division: Occupational Licensing Date/Time 2/10/03 12:00 PM
Approved by: Edgar Blatchford, Commissioner Date 2/10/2003
Agency: Department of Community & Economic Development

23-LS0810A
Lauterbach
3/12/03

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO.
IN THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF ALASKA
TWENTY-THIRD LEGISLATURE - FIRST SESSION

BY THE SENATE FINANCE COMMITTEE

Introduced:
Referred:

A RESOLUTION

1 **Suspending Rules 24(c), 35, 41(b), and 42(e), Uniform Rules of the Alaska State**
2 **Legislature, concerning House Bill No. 71, relating to the Board of Certified Direct-**
3 **Entry Midwives.**

4 **BE IT RESOLVED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF ALASKA:**

5 That under Rule 54, Uniform Rules of the Alaska State Legislature, the provisions of
6 Rules 24(c), 35, 41(b), and 42(e), Uniform Rules of the Alaska State Legislature, regarding
7 changes to the title of a bill, are suspended in consideration of House Bill No. 71, relating to
8 the Board of Certified Direct-Entry Midwives.

SENATE CS FOR HOUSE BILL NO. 71(FIN)
IN THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF ALASKA
TWENTY-THIRD LEGISLATURE - FIRST SESSION

BY THE SENATE FINANCE COMMITTEE

Offered:
Referred:

Sponsor(s): HOUSE STATE AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

A BILL
FOR AN ACT ENTITLED

1 "An Act extending the termination date of the Board of Certified Direct-Entry
2 Midwives; and relating to the regulation of certified direct-entry midwives."

3 BE IT ENACTED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF ALASKA:

4 * Section 1. AS 08.03.010(c)(8) is amended to read:

5 (8) Board of Certified Direct-Entry Midwives (AS 08.65.010) --
6 June 30, 2007 [2003];

7 * Sec. 2. AS 08.65.060 is amended to read:

8 Sec. 08.65.060. Examinations. The board shall conduct examinations at least
9 once each year. Examinations may be written, oral, or practical or a combination of
10 these. The board shall utilize the examination provided by a nationally certified
11 midwives organization recognized by the board. An applicant who has failed the
12 examination may not retake the examination for a period of six months. An applicant
13 who has failed the examination more than one time may not retake the examination
14 unless the applicant has participated in or successfully completed further education

1
2
3

and training programs as prescribed by the board. The board may require an applicant to pass an examination about Alaska laws that are applicable to the profession of direct-entry midwives.

ALASKA STATE LEGISLATURE

REPRESENTATIVE BRUCE WEYHRAUCH



ALASKA
STATE CAPITOL
JUNEAU, ALASKA
99801-1182

(907) 465-3744
FAX (907) 465-2273

STATE AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

HB 71

Sponsor Statement

Extend The Board of Certified Direct-Entry Midwives

The Board of Certified Direct-Entry Midwives consists of five members appointed by the Governor: one public member, two certified direct-entry midwives (CDMs), one certified nurse midwife, and one physician who is either an obstetrician or who has specialized obstetric training. The duties of the board include examining and certifying applicants, permitting apprentices, holding hearings and ordering disciplinary sanctions. The board also adopts regulations to establish certification and certification renewal requirements.

The board has served as a means to make people practicing midwifery aware of the level of experience and education expected of them. Also, by having a board, the individuals that practice midwifery are held accountable to an established standard of care. Women seeking an alternative to hospital care for normal pregnancy and birth rely on the diligence of the board to enhance both the quality and accessibility of their healthcare. One notable enhancement: the board worked with the State of Alaska to establish Medicaid procedures for CDM services, thereby placing Alaska among eight states which both license their traditional midwives and provide Medicaid reimbursement for their services.

The board is scheduled to terminate on June 30, 2003, and if the legislature does not act this session, the board will have one year to conclude its administrative operations. Based upon recommendations by the Division of Legislative Audit, HB 71 would extend the board's termination date to June 30, 2007.

Released: February 1, 2003

Contact: Rep. Bruce Weyhrauch's office at 907.465.3744

Audit Report



DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY
AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
BOARD OF CERTIFIED
DIRECT-ENTRY MIDWIVES
SUNSET REVIEW

August 15, 2002



Audit Control Number:

08-20016-02

Division of Legislative Audit

P.O. Box 113300, Juneau, Alaska 99811-3300

LEGISLATIVE BUDGET AND A

DIVISION OF LEGISLATIVE A

The Legislative Budget and Audit Committee is a permanent. The committee is made up of five senators and five representatives, two from the House. The chairmanship of the committee rotates between the legislature.

The committee is responsible for providing the legislature with information on programs and activities of state government now cost money. As administrators try increasingly to allocate state revenues more efficiently, they need information to evaluate the work of government. The Division of Legislative Audit helps provide that information.

As a guide to all their work, the Division of Legislative Audit follows the standards established by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants and the standards established by the U.S. General Accounting Office.

Audits are performed as mandated by Alaska Statutes or at the direction of the legislature. Individual legislators or committees can submit requests for audits or for a study for consideration. Copies of all completed audits are available from the Division of Legislative Audit in Juneau, Anchorage, or our web site <http://www.legis.state.ak.us/legaudit>

BUDGET AND AUDIT COMMITTEE

Senator Gene Therriault, Chair
Senator Dave Donley
Senator Lyman Hoffman
Senator Randy Phillips
Senator Jerry Ward
Senator Gary Wilken (alternate)

Representative Hugh Fate, Vice Chair
Representative John Harris
Representative Reggie Joule
Representative Ken Lancaster
Representative Eldon Mulder
Representative Bill Williams (alternate)
Representative John Davies (alternate)

DIVISION OF LEGISLATIVE AUDIT

Pat Davidson, CPA
Legislative Auditor

P.O. Box 113300
Juneau, AK 99811-3300

(907)465-3830, Juneau
(907)561-1445, Anchorage
(907)465-2347, Juneau Fax
(907)561-1452 Anchorage Fax



J U N E A U
FAMILY BIRTH
C E N T E R

Juneau Family Birth Center

3225 Hospital Drive, Suite 106, Juneau, AK 99801 (907)586-1203

Midwives Association of Alaska
Kaye Kanne, CDM, President
P.O. Box 22256
Juneau, Ak 99802
907-586-1203

Representative Bruce Weyrauch
State Capitol, Room 427
Juneau, Ak 99801

January 29, 2003

Dear Representative Weyrauch,

Thank you for introducing HB 71, a bill to extend the Certified Direct-Entry Licensing Board. I had the privilege of sitting on the Board from its inception in 1992 through 1999. The Board has done an exemplary job of writing and implementing regulations for the governing of Certified Direct-Entry midwives in Alaska. The Board continues to strive for the highest standards for CDM's and as a result, midwives in Alaska are professional, well trained and provide safe, excellent care for women and families.

Alaska has one of the best midwifery laws in the United States. Many other states have looked to us as an example when passing midwifery legislation. Direct-Entry midwifery is increasingly recognized across the nation, with licensing for direct-entry midwives in 21 states, and legislation pending in 8 more states. Many more women are seeking the continuity of care and family centered maternity care which midwifery can provide.

The American Public Health Association endorses state regulated and national certified Direct-Entry midwives to improve outcomes while lowering healthcare costs for maternity care. They support efforts to increase access to out-of-hospital maternity care services, through recognition that Direct-Entry midwives can serve clients desiring, safe, planned out-of-hospital midwifery care.

Alaska is at the forefront of Direct-Entry midwifery licensing. Let's continue the excellent work we have been doing by continuing the Certified Direct-Entry licensing Board for another 4 years.

Sincerely,

Kaye Kanne, CDM, President
Midwives Association of Alaska

Kaye Kanne, CDM, President
Midwives Association of Alaska
3225 Hospital Drive, #106
Juneau, Alaska 99801
(907) 586-1203

February 10, 2003

Testimony for HB 71, Labor and Commerce Committee

Thank you for this opportunity to testify to your committee. I am asking for your support on HB 71, a bill to extend the Certified Direct-Entry Licensing Board. I was a member of the Board from its inception in 1992 through 1999. The Board has done an excellent job of writing and implementing regulations for the governing of Certified Direct-Entry midwives in Alaska. The Board continues to strive for the highest standards for CDM's and as a result, midwives in Alaska are professional, well trained and provide safe, excellent care for women and families.

Alaska's Certified Direct-Entry midwives delivered almost 10% of the babies born in Alaska last year. In some communities this percentage is even higher, almost 25% in Matsu-Susitna Borough, 15% in Juneau, and 12% in Fairbanks. Nation wide direct-entry midwives attend approximately 5% of the births. Many more women are seeking the continuity of care and family centered maternity care which midwifery can provide.

Alaska has one of the best midwifery laws in the United States. Many other states have looked to us as an example when passing midwifery legislation. Direct-Entry midwifery is increasingly recognized across the nation, with licensing for direct-entry midwives in 21 states, and legislation pending in 8 more states.

The American Public Health Association endorses state regulated and national certified Direct-Entry midwives to improve outcomes while lowering healthcare costs for maternity care. They support efforts to increase access to out-of-hospital maternity care services, through recognition that Direct-Entry midwives can serve clients desiring, safe, planned out-of-hospital midwifery care.

Alaska is at the forefront of Direct-Entry Midwifery licensing. Let's continue the excellent work we have been doing by continuing the Certified Direct-Entry licensing Board for another 4 years.

BIRTHS AND PERCENTAGE OF BIRTHS BY CERTIFIED DIRECT MIDWIFE: 1997-2002

Census Area of Occurrence	1997		1998		1999		2000		2001		2002	
	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#
ALASKA	2.18	217	2.52	250	3.82	381	5.23	522	7.95	787	9.31	834
Aleutians West	100.0	1	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0
Bethel	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.5	2	0.0	0	0.0	0
Dillingham	0.0	0	0.0	0	1.5	1	1.8	1	0.0	0	0.0	0
Fairbanks North Star Borough	2.4	39	2.9	48	5.5	86	6.8	117	7.9	129	12.6	194
Juneau Borough	3.5	14	7.9	32	15.1	64	12.3	52	14.4	64	15.2	57
Kenai Peninsula Borough	1.9	11	2.7	15	3.1	18	11.2	57	17.1	93	26.7	125
Ketchikan Gateway Borough	0.7	2	0.0	0	0.0	0	1.4	4	0.0	0	0.0	0
Kodiak Island Borough	3.6	9	2.5	6	2.2	5	2.8	6	2.0	4	1.7	3
Matanuska-Susitna Borough	14.9	71	18.7	87	21.7	105	18.0	100	16.8	92	24.7	130
Municipality of Anchorage	1.2	59	0.9	47	1.6	85	3.2	169	7.4	396	6.5	321
Nome	2.4	3	6.7	8	6.2	7	3.3	3	0.8	1	1.1	1
North Slope Borough	0.0	0	0.0	0	3.7	2	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0
Sitka Borough	2.0	3	0.0	0	2.3	3	3.7	5	4.7	6	0.9	1
Skagway-Hoonah-Angoon	0.0	0	100.0	1	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0
Southeast Fairbanks	5.3	1	0.0	0	15.4	2	20.0	1	7.7	1	0.0	0
Valdez-Cordova	5.9	3	4.1	2	0.0	0	2.9	1	1.8	1	3.0	1
Yukon-Koyukuk	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	33.3	1	0.0	0	0.0	0
Census Area Unknown	0.7	1	3.6	4	2.3	3	2.5	3	0.0	0	50.0	1

"Increasing Access To Out-Of-Hospital Maternity Care Services Through State-Regulated and Nationally-Certified Direct-Entry Midwives"

Formally adopted by the Governing Council of the American Public Health Association (APHA)
Wednesday, October 24, 2001

THE AMERICAN PUBLIC HEALTH ASSOCIATION,

Reaffirming its position on credentials for health occupations, that there should be alternative routes involving educational systems of selection and preparation, and legal systems of licensing by which people can prepare and qualify for health occupations (1)

Reaffirming its recognition that many women seek birthing alternatives(2) and,

Recognizing that pregnancy and birth are normal life events for a majority of women, (3,4,5) and,

Reaffirming its endorsement of the philosophy of family-centered maternity care, the importance of continuity of care, and the use of a variety of licensed care-givers, (6)

Recognizing that Direct-entry Midwives encompass a diverse group of midwives that have entered the profession directly through midwifery education and training, and not through a pre-requisite program such as nursing.(7)
Recognizing that there are alternative educational systems of selection and preparation for national certification of Direct entry Midwives that include either the Certified Professional Midwife (CPM) credential and the Certified Midwife (CM) credential; and that both require didactic programs, written examinations and clinical experience. (8,9) In the case of the Certified Professional Midwives the didactic component consists of education in a program accredited by an agency that is recognized by the US Department of Education or the PEP Program, the North American Registry of Midwives competency-based, educational portfolio evaluation, and the clinical component is equivalent to one year of experience which includes more than a thousand contact hours under the supervision of one or more preceptors, some of which must be in out-of-hospital settings, but none of which need to be in hospital settings;(8) and in the case of the Certified Midwife (CM) credential requires education in institutions of higher learning accredited by an agency that is recognized by the US Department of Education to meet the same standards that Certified Nurse Midwives must meet, completing core science requirements similar to those required for a nurse, and fulfilling core midwifery requirements that are a part of all accredited nurse-midwifery education programs, and clinical experience that must include hospital experience, but is not required to include out-of-hospital experience.(9)

Recognizing that individual states interested in incorporating direct-entry midwives into their health care systems are moving towards regulatory models based on national certification.(5)

Recognizing evidence that many women seek alternatives to hospital care for normal pregnancy and birth, and,

Recognizing the evidence that births to healthy mothers, who are not considered at medical risk after comprehensive screening by trained professionals, can occur safely in various settings, including out-of-hospital birth centers and homes (10,11,12,13,14) and,

Noting that an epidemiological study of Certified Professional Midwives (CPMs) is ongoing in order to further substantiate practice outcomes, safety, client satisfaction, and practitioner competency is in progress; (15)

Recognizing that out-of-hospital settings have the potential for reducing the costs of maternity care; (7,12,16)

Recognizing evidence that access to quality maternity caregivers remains an important issue, particularly for underserved urban and rural communities;(17) which may be addressed through out-of-hospital maternity services in some communities; and

Reaffirming that the APHA currently recognizes the value of and promotes educational opportunities for nurse-midwifery,(18) and that many professionals recognize the contributions of direct-entry midwifery; and,

Reaffirming that APHA has been an innovator in public health care by supporting research on alternative and complementary medicine (1,19) and increased access to midwifery services in the United States, (20)

Recognizing that there should be alternative routes involving educational systems of selection and preparation, and legal systems of licensing by which people can prepare and qualify for health occupations, including those direct-entry midwives who are nationally-certified and who have successfully completed "a recognized midwifery education process"; (21,22,23,25) and

Recognizing evidence that direct-entry midwives have multiple educational routes (22,24) available to them in order to meet the entry-level requirements of knowledge, skills and experience; (22,24,25)

Recognizing evidence that individual states interested in incorporating direct-entry midwives into the health care system are moving towards regulatory models based on national certifications; (22)

Therefore, APHA

- Supports efforts to increase access to out-of-hospital maternity care services and increase the range of quality maternity care choices available to consumers, through recognition that legally-regulated and nationally certified direct-entry midwives can serve clients desiring safe, planned, out-of-hospital maternity care services, and further:
- Encourages the development and implementation of guidelines for the licensing, certification and practice for direct-entry midwifery practitioners for use by state and local health agencies, health planners, maternity care providers, and professional organizations;
- Urges that there be increased opportunities, for supervised, clinical learning experiences, in a variety of settings, including both high-risk and low-risk, incorporated into direct-entry midwifery education programs;
- Encourages an increase in cost effective maternal care services for rural and underserved urban populations by advocating for increases in funding of scholarships and loan repayment programs targeted at members of these communities;
- Urges public and private insurance plans to eliminate barriers to the reimbursement and equitable payment of direct-entry midwifery services in both public and private payment systems;
- Encourages the National Center for Health Statistics, the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services and State Vital Records Offices to add the CPM as a separate certifier category on birth certificates to enable routine collection of systematic data;
- Urges HRSA, CDC and state health departments to improve the collection and quality of vital statistics and other data to enhance the monitoring of birth outcomes (e.g., infant and perinatal mortality rates, maternal mortality rates, etc.) resulting from services provided by all practitioners including specific types of midwife practitioners;
- Urges Congress and appropriate Department of Health and Human Services agencies to increase funding and other support for ongoing research and evaluation of maternal health and birth outcomes, practice outcomes, quality of care outcomes, and safety related to the services provided by direct-entry midwives;

References:

1. American Public Health Association Policy Statement 6805: Credentials for Health Occupations. APHA Public Policy Statements, 1948 to present, cumulative. Washington, D.C. current volume.
2. American Public Health Association Position Paper 8209: Guidelines for Licensing and Regulating Birth Centers. APHA Public Policy Statements, 1948 to present, cumulative. Washington, D.C. current volume.
3. Stewart, David: The Five Standards of Safe Childbearing. NAPJAC International, 4th Edition, 1997.



J U N E A U
FAMILY BIRTH
C E N T E R

Juneau Family Birth Center

3225 Hospital Drive, Suite 106, Juneau, AK 99801 (907)586-1203

Midwives Association of Alaska
Kaye Kanne, CDM, President
P.O. Box 22256
Juneau, Ak 99802
907-586-1203

Representative Nancy Dalstrom
State Capitol, room 408
Juneau, Ak 99801

February 6, 2003

Dear Representative Dalstrom,

I am asking for your support on HB 71, a bill to extend the Certified Direct-Entry Licensing Board. I sat on the Board from its inception in 1992 through 1999. The Board has done an exemplary job of writing and implementing regulations for the governing of Certified Direct-Entry midwives in Alaska. The Board continues to strive for the highest standards for CDM's and as a result, midwives in Alaska are professional, well trained and provide safe, excellent care for women and families.

Alaska has one of the best midwifery laws in the United States. Many other states have looked to us as an example when passing midwifery legislation. Direct-Entry midwifery is increasingly recognized across the nation, with licensing for direct-entry midwives in 21 states, and legislation pending in 8 more states. Many more women are seeking the continuity of care and family centered maternity care which midwifery can provide.

The American Public Health Association endorses state regulated and national certified Direct-Entry midwives to improve outcomes while lowering healthcare costs for maternity care. They support efforts to increase access to out-of-hospital maternity care services, through recognition that Direct-Entry midwives can serve clients desiring, safe, planned out-of-hospital midwifery care.

Alaska is at the forefront of Direct-Entry midwifery licensing. Let's continue the excellent work we have been doing by continuing the Certified Direct-Entry licensing Board for another 4 years.

Sincerely,

Kaye Kanne, CDM, President
Midwives Association of Alaska

Overview of Maternity Care in the US *

Carolyn Keefe, MLS

With four million births each year¹ and three-quarters of American women becoming mothers, maternity care affects large numbers of women. It is also big business. The United States has the highest per capita spending on health care in the world, with maternity care ranking sixth overall,² and childbirth is the most common reason for the hospitalization of women in the United States.

Women are subjected to an ever-increasing array of interventions and technologies, many of which are highly invasive, with little or no evidence of their effectiveness. In fact, the medical evidence shows that the routine use of unnecessary interventions put mothers and babies at risk. Medical interventions are also expensive and often used not for the benefit of women and babies, but for the convenience or legal protection of doctors and hospitals.

All of this would be acceptable if we had better outcomes to show for it. Unfortunately, our outcomes are not nearly as good as those of developed countries that rely more heavily on midwifery care. Some of the clear problems with our maternity care system include:

- A high infant mortality rate compared to other developed countries – 27th in the world.³ Infant mortality rates are higher for African American, Latina and Native American babies – with the rate for African American babies twice that of white babies.⁴
- A maternal mortality rate that has not improved in 20 years – 15th in the world.⁵ Maternal mortality is higher for women of color than for white women, nearly four times higher for African American women.⁶
- A cesarean birth rate of 24.4% – among the highest in the world. Cesarean birth rates are highest for African American women, followed by white women, Latina women, Asian women, and Native American women.⁷
- A 20% drop in vaginal births after cesarean (VBAC) from 2000 to 2001 to 16.4% – access to VBAC is disappearing requiring many women who have cesarean scars to undergo surgery.⁸
- An induction rate of 20.5% – which has more than doubled since 1989 and continues to rise.⁹
- Many mothers traumatized by their treatment during birth, with as many as 30% exhibiting some signs of post-traumatic stress disorder¹⁰ and 50% experiencing some aspect of postpartum depression (the highest such rate in the world).¹¹

Moreover:

- Of the eight most common surgical procedures in the US, four are obstetric in nature – episiotomy, repair of obstetric laceration, cesarean birth, artificial rupture of membranes. These are in also the top four surgeries performed on women in the US.¹²
- Obstetric procedures are the most common type of surgical procedures performed in the US (6,174,000), slightly higher than cardiac procedures (6,133,000). Consider the following:
 - obstetric procedures are only performed on women – more obstetric procedures are performed on women than the next two categories (cardiac and digestive) combined;
 - there are over six million obstetric procedures, but just over four million births;
 - these procedures are primarily performed on healthy bodies during a normal physiological process.

Fact Sheet

The problem has steadily gotten worse over the last two decades. All obstetric procedures combined nearly doubled between 1980 and 1999, while certain procedures, such as medical induction of labor, vacuum extraction, and manually assisted delivery increased eleven-fold in that time.¹ Each procedure carries with it risks to mothers and babies, and less invasive techniques exist for most of them. Furthermore, they are usually not medically necessary and are avoidable for the majority of women.

The Midwives Model of Care¹⁴ and the evidence-based Mother-Friendly Childbirth Initiative¹⁵ recognize birth as a normal, natural process and support the use of less invasive techniques, such as position changes, waiting, hydrotherapy, and perineal support, that carry fewer risks to mothers and babies and are usually more effective.

Research shows that midwives are the safest birth attendants for most women, with lower infant and maternal mortality rates and fewer invasive interventions such as episiotomies and surgical births (cesareans). In developed countries where midwives are the primary care providers for pregnant women, mortality and surgical birth rates are much lower than in the United States. However, legal, regulatory, and financial barriers to the practicing the Midwives Model of Care and Mother-Friendly care make it difficult for women to access either in the US.

References:

- ¹ Martin, Joyce, et al, "Births Final Data for 2001," *National Vital Statistics Reports*, Vol 51, No. 5, December 18, 2002, p. 1
- ² 1999 National Statistics, HCUPnet, Healthcare Cost and Utilization Project. Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality, Rockville, MD. <http://www.ahrq.gov/data/hcup/hcupnet.htm>.
- ³ *Child Health USA 2001*, Maternal Child Health Bureau, Health Resources and Services Administration, US Department of Health and Human Services, p. 22.
- ⁴ Hoyert, DL; et al, "Deaths: Final Data for 1999," *National Vital Statistics Report*, Vol. 49, No. 8, September 21, 2001, p. 11.
- ⁵ *State of the World's Mothers 2002*, Save the Children, http://www.savethechildren.org/mothers/sowm02/report/complete_index.pdf.
- ⁶ Hoyert, DL; et al, "Deaths: Final Data for 1999," *National Vital Statistics Report*, Vol. 49, No. 8, September 21, 2001, p. 89.
- ⁷ Martin, Joyce, et al, "Births Final Data for 2001," *National Vital Statistics Reports*, Vol 51, No. 5, December 18, 2002, p. 16
- ⁸ Martin, Joyce, et al, "Births Final Data for 2001," *National Vital Statistics Reports*, Vol 51, No. 5, December 18, 2002, p. 16
- ⁹ Martin, Joyce, et al, "Births Final Data for 2001," *National Vital Statistics Reports*, Vol 51, No. 5, December 18, 2002, p. 15
- ¹⁰ Creedy DK, Shochet IM, Horsfall J. "Childbirth and the development of acute trauma symptoms: incidence and contributing factors." *Birth*, 2000 Jun; 27(2):104-11
- ¹¹ Wolf, Naomi, *Misconceptions: Truth, Lies, and the Unexpected on the Journey to Motherhood*. Doubleday, 2001, p. 216.
- ¹² Popovic JR. "1999 National Hospital Discharge Survey: Annual Summary with detailed diagnosis and procedure data," *Vital Health Statistics* 13(151). 2001, p. 35.
- ¹³ *IBID*, p. 46.
- ¹⁴ Developed in 1996 by Midwifery Task Force, www.midwiferytaskforce.org.
- ¹⁵ Developed in 1996 by the Coalition for Improving Maternity Services, www.mother-friendly.org.

* Reflects 2001 data.

Reprinted with permission from BirthNet.

Safety in Birth Begins With Midwifery Care

"In terms of quality, satisfaction, and costs, the midwifery model for pregnancy and maternity care has been found to be beneficial to women and families, resulting in good outcomes and cost savings. ... With its focus on pregnancy as a normal life event and health promotion for women of all ages, the midwifery model of care is an appropriate alternative or complement to the medical approach to childbirth."

American Public Health Association, "Supporting Access to Midwifery Services in the United States (Position Paper)", *American Journal of Public Health*, Vol. 91, No. 3, March 2001.

"It is inherently unwise, and perhaps unsafe, for women with normal pregnancies to be cared for by obstetric specialists ... Midwives and general practitioners, on the other hand, are primarily oriented to the care of women with normal pregnancies, and are likely to have more detailed knowledge of individual women."

Murray Enkin, et al, *A Guide to Effective Care in Pregnancy and Childbirth*. Oxford University Press, 2000.

"It is the finding and vision of the Taskforce that the midwifery model of care is an essential element of comprehensive health care for women and their families that should be embraced by, and incorporated into, the health care system and made available to all women."

Dower CM, Miller JE, O'Neil EH and the Taskforce on Midwifery, *Charting a Course for the 21st Century: The Future of Midwifery*. San Francisco, CA: Pew Health Professions Commission and the UCSF Center for the Health Professions. April 1999.

"Midwives are the most appropriate primary health care provider to be assigned to the care of normal birth."

Maternal and Newborn Health/Safe Motherhood Unit of the World Health Organization, *Care in Normal Birth: A practical guide*. World Health Organization, 1996.

"Midwives attend the vast majority of births in those industrialized countries with the best perinatal outcomes..."

Coalition for Improving Maternity Services, *The Mother-Friendly Childbirth Initiative*, 1996

The Safety of Home Birth

The evidence is overwhelming – planned home birth is safe for healthy women

"Recognizing the evidence that births to healthy mothers, who are not considered at medical risk after comprehensive screening by trained professionals, can occur safely in various settings, including out-of-hospital birth centers and homes ...Therefore, APHA Supports efforts to increase access to out-of-hospital maternity care services..."

American Public Health Association, "Increasing Access to Out-of-Hospital Maternity Care Services through State-Regulated and Nationally-Certified Direct-Entry Midwives (Policy Statement)". *American Journal of Public Health*, Vol 92, No. 3, March 2002.

"Several methodologically sound observational studies have compared the outcomes of planned home-births (irrespective of the eventual place of birth) with planned hospital-births for women with similar characteristics. A meta-analysis of these studies showed no maternal mortality, and no statistically significant differences in perinatal mortality risk in either direction."

Murray Enkin, et al, *A Guide to Effective Care in Pregnancy and Childbirth*. Oxford University Press, 2000.

"It is safe to say that a woman should give birth in a place where she feels is safe, and at the most peripheral level at which appropriate care is feasible and safe. For a low-risk pregnant woman this can be at home, at a small maternity clinic or birth centre, in town or perhaps at the maternity unit of a larger hospital. However, it must be a place where all the attention and care are focused on her needs and safety, as close to home and her own culture as possible.

Maternal and Newborn Health/Safe Motherhood Unit of the World Health Organization, *Care in Normal Birth: A practical guide*. World Health Organization, 1996.

"Excellent outcomes with much lower intervention rates are achieved at home births. This may be because the overuse of interventions in hospital births introduces risks or the home environment promotes problem-free labors."

Henci Goer, *Obstetric Myths versus Research Realities: A Guide to the Medical Literature*. Bergin & Garvey, 1995.

"This study supports previous research indicating that planned home birth with qualified care providers can be a safe alternative for healthy lower risk women."

Anderson RE, Murphy PA. "Outcomes Of 11,788 Planned Home Births Attended By Certified Nurse-Midwives. A Retrospective Descriptive Study." *Journal of Nurse-Midwifery*, 1995 Nov-Dec;40(6):483-92. (Abst)

SENATE FINANCE COMMITTEE

SIGN-IN

HB 71-EXTEND BOARD OF MIDWIVES

NAME: Kaye Kanne, COM Subject/Bill No: 71
 Co./Dept./Title: President Midwives Ass. of Alaska Phone: 586-1203
 Address: PO BOX 22256 JUNEAU Zip: 99802

Do you wish to testify? Yes No Respond To Questions

NAME: _____ Subject/Bill No: _____
 Co./Dept./Title: _____ Phone: _____
 Address: _____ Zip: _____

Do you wish to testify? Yes No Respond To Questions

NAME: _____ Subject/Bill No: _____
 Co./Dept./Title: _____ Phone: _____
 Address: _____ Zip: _____

Do you wish to testify? Yes No Respond To Questions

NAME: _____ Subject/Bill No: _____
 Co./Dept./Title: _____ Phone: _____
 Address: _____ Zip: _____

Do you wish to testify? Yes No Respond To Questions

SENATE FINANCE COMMITTEE

SIGN-IN

HB 71-EXTEND BOARD OF MIDWIVES

NAME: Kaye Kanne Subject/Bill No: 71
Co./Dept./Title: President Midwives Ass. of Alaska Phone: 586-1203
Address: PO Box 22256 Zip: 99802
Do you wish to testify? Yes No Respond To Questions

NAME: Pat Dawson Subject/Bill No: HB 71
Co./Dept./Title: Leg Asst Phone: 465-3830
Address: _____ Zip: _____
Do you wish to testify? Yes No Respond To Questions

NAME: Rick Uriah Subject/Bill No: 71
Co./Dept./Title: Director Division of Occupational Licensing Phone: _____
Address: _____ Zip: _____
Do you wish to testify? Yes No Respond To Questions

NAME: _____ Subject/Bill No: _____
Co./Dept./Title: _____ Phone: _____
Address: _____ Zip: _____
Do you wish to testify? Yes No Respond To Questions

HB

73

HFIN

FILE

FISCAL NOTE

STATE OF ALASKA
2003 LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Fiscal Note Number: _____
 Bill Version: CSHB 73(FIN)
 () Publish Date: _____

Revision Date/Time (Note if correction): _____
 Title An Act extending the termination date of the
State Medical Board.
 Sponsor Reps. Dahlstrom, Stoltze, Wilson
 Requester House Finance

Dept. Affected: DCED
 BRU Occupational Licensing (117)
 Component Occupational Licensing
 Component No. 2360

Expenditures/Revenues (Thousands of Dollars)

Note: Amounts do not include inflation unless otherwise noted below.

OPERATING EXPENDITURES	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009
Personal Services	389.5	389.5	389.5	389.5	389.5	389.5
Travel	33.8	33.8	33.8	33.8	33.8	33.8
Contractual	301.4	301.4	301.4	301.4	301.4	301.4
Supplies	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Equipment	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Land & Structures						
Grants & Claims						
Miscellaneous						
TOTAL OPERATING	729.7	729.7	729.7	729.7	729.7	729.7

CAPITAL EXPENDITURES						
-----------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

CHANGE IN REVENUES ()	729.7	729.7	729.7	729.7	729.7	729.7
-------------------------------	--------------	--------------	--------------	--------------	--------------	--------------

FUND SOURCE (Thousands of Dollars)

1002 Federal Receipts						
1003 GF Match						
1004 GF						
1005 GF/Program Receipts						
1037 GF/Mental Health						
Other 1156- Receipt Supported Services	729.7	729.7	729.7	729.7	729.7	729.7
TOTAL	729.7	729.7	729.7	729.7	729.7	729.7

Estimate of any current year (FY2003) cost: 0.0

Mark this box (X) if funding for this bill is included in the Governor's FY 2004 budget proposal:

POSITIONS

Full-time	5	5	5	5	5	5
Part-time						
Temporary						

ANALYSIS: (Attach a separate page if necessary)

The bill extends the State Medical Board to June 30, 2011. In accordance with AS 08.03.020, funding is extended one year following the termination date allowing the board to conclude its affairs. The information above identifies direct expenditure and revenue information included in the FY 2004 Operating Budget request. New funds are not required to implement this bill.

Prepared by: Jennifer Strickler, Administrative Manager
 Division: Occupational Licensing
 Approved by: Edgar Blatchford, Commissioner
 Agency: Department of Community & Economic Development

Phone (907) 465-2144
 Date/Time 2/24/03 3:44 PM
 Date 2/24/2003

adopted
N/D

23-LS0475A.1
Lauterbach
2/25/03

AMENDMENT

OFFERED IN THE HOUSE

TO: HB 73

- 1 Page 1, line 4:
- 2 Delete "2007"
- 3 Insert "2011"

Subject: Fiscal Notes

Date: Mon, 24 Feb 2003 15:52:51 -0900

From: Jenny Strickler <Jenny_Strickler@dced.state.ak.us>

To: Sally A Saddler <sally_saddler@dced.state.ak.us>

CC: Robert E Riggs JR <robert_riggs@dced.state.ak.us>

Sally,

I received a call from Randy in Representative William's Office (House Finance) for the attached Fiscal Notes.


Currently, CSHB73(FIN) and CSHB74(FIN) do not exist, however, Representative Dahlstrom is going to submit the Committee Substitute in House Finance this coming Thursday, 2/27/03, to make these bills identical to the Senate versions that extend the boards to 2011.


I told him I would submit these Fiscal Notes to you to forward to the appropriate places. He said he'd watch for them.

Jenny

--

Jennifer Strickler
Administrative Manager
Division of Occupational Licensing
E-Mail: Jenny_Strickler@dced.state.ak.us

 CSHB73(FIN)-MedExt.xls	Name: CSHB73(FIN)-MedExt.xls Type: Microsoft Excel Worksheet (application/vnd.ms-excel) Encoding: base64
--	---

 CSHB74(FIN)-NsgExt.xls	Name: CSHB74(FIN)-NsgExt.xls Type: Microsoft Excel Worksheet (application/vnd.ms-excel) Encoding: base64
--	---

FISCAL NOTE

STATE OF ALASKA
2003 LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Fiscal Note Number: 1
Bill Version: HB 73
(H) Publish Date: 2/12/03

Revision Date/Time (Note if correction):
Title An Act extending the termination date of the State Medical Board
Sponsor Representative Dahlstrom
Requester House Labor & Commerce
Dept. Affected: DCED
BRU Occupational Licensing (117)
Component Occupational Licensing
Component No. 2360

Expenditures/Revenues (Thousands of Dollars)

Note: Amounts do not include inflation unless otherwise noted below.

OPERATING EXPENDITURES	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009
Personal Services	389.5	389.5	389.5	389.5	389.5	389.5
Travel	33.8	33.8	33.8	33.8	33.8	33.8
Contractual	301.4	301.4	301.4	301.4	301.4	301.4
Supplies	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Equipment	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Land & Structures						
Grants & Claims						
Miscellaneous						
TOTAL OPERATING	729.7	729.7	729.7	729.7	729.7	0.0

CAPITAL EXPENDITURES						
-----------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

CHANGE IN REVENUES (1156)	729.7	729.7	729.7	729.7	729.7	
----------------------------------	--------------	--------------	--------------	--------------	--------------	--

FUND SOURCE (Thousands of Dollars)

1002 Federal Receipts						
1003 GF Match						
1004 GF						
1005 GF/Program Receipts						
1037 GF/Mental Health						
Other 1156- Receipt Supported Services	729.7	729.7	729.7	729.7	729.7	
TOTAL	729.7	729.7	729.7	729.7	729.7	0.0

Estimate of any current year (FY2003) cost: 729.7
Mark this box (X) if funding for this bill is included in the Governor's FY 2004 budget proposal:

POSITIONS

Full-time	5	5	5	5	5
Part-time					
Temporary					

ANALYSIS: (Attach a separate page if necessary)

The bill extends the State Medical Board to June 30, 2007. In accordance with AS 08.03.020, funding is extended one year following the termination date allowing the board to conclude its affairs. The information above identifies direct expenditure and revenue information included in the FY 2004 Operating Budget request. New funds are not required to implement this bill.

Prepared by: Jennifer Strickler, Administrative Manager Phone (907) 465-2144
Division: Occupational Licensing Date/Time 2/10/03 12:01 PM
Approved by: Edgar Blatchford, Commissioner Date 2/10/2003
Agency: Department of Community & Economic Development

THE
FOLLOWING
DOCUMENT(S)
ARE
POOR
ORIGINAL
COPIES

Audit Report

DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY
AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
STATE MEDICAL BOARD
SUNSET REVIEW

August 15, 2002



Audit Control Number:

08-20017-02

Division of Legislative Audit
P.O. Box 118300, Juneau, Alaska 99811-3300

THE HISTORY OF THE

REIGN OF

CHARLES THE FIRST

BY
JAMES CLAYTON

IN TWO VOLUMES

LONDON: RICHARD CLAY AND COMPANY, LTD.

1910

ALASKA STATE LEGISLATURE

LEGISLATIVE BUDGET AND AUDIT COMMITTEE

Division of Legislative Audit



P.O. Box 113300
Juneau, AK 99811-3300
(907) 465-3830
FAX (907) 465-2347
Internet e-mail address:
legaudit@legis.state.ak.us

August 17, 2002

Members of the Legislative Budget
and Audit Committee:

In accordance with the provisions of Title 24 of the Alaska Statutes, the attached report is submitted for your review.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT STATE MEDICAL BOARD SUNSET REVIEW

August 15, 2002

Audit Control Number

08-20017-02

This audit was conducted as required by AS 44.66.050 and under the authority of AS 24.20.271(1). Alaska Statute 44.66.050(c) lists criteria to be used to assess the demonstrated public need for a given board, commission, agency, or program subject to the sunset review process. Currently under AS 08.03.010(c)(12), the State Medical Board is scheduled to terminate on June 30, 2003. The board would be allowed one year in which to conclude its administrative operations.

In our opinion, the termination date for the State Medical Board should be extended. The regulation and licensure of physicians, osteopaths, podiatrists, paramedics and physician assistants contributes to the protection of the public's welfare. We recommend the legislature extend the termination date of the State Medical Board to June 30, 2011.

This sunset review was conducted in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards. Fieldwork procedures utilized in the course of developing this report are set out in the Objectives, Scope and Methodology section.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Pat Davidson".

Pat Davidson, CPA
Legislative Auditor